





1935-48183 LTA  
**COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION**  
(EDUCATION—Part 5)

---

**HEARINGS**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES**  
Congress. **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS**  
**FIRST SESSION**

---

APRIL 29, MAY 19, 26, 27, AND 28, 1953

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1953

Boston Public Library  
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 14 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

---

|                                           |      |
|-------------------------------------------|------|
| April 29, 1953 :                          | Page |
| Testimony of Harold T. Woerner, Jr-----   | 1504 |
| May 19, 1953 :                            |      |
| Testimony of William T. Parry-----        | 1511 |
| May 26, 1953 :                            |      |
| Testimony of Marcus Singer-----           | 1537 |
| May 27, 1953 :                            |      |
| Testimony of Marcus Singer (resumed)----- | 1547 |
| May 28, 1953 :                            |      |
| Testimony of Abe Gelbart-----             | 1565 |
| Appendix-----                             | 1583 |
| Index-----                                | 1585 |



The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

## PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### RULE X

#### SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

### RULE XI

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE X

### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, following standing committees:

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE XI

### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

## (EDUCATION—PART 5)

---

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:05 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. Jackson presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, and Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show for the purposes of this hearing this morning, under the authority vested in the chairman under Public Law 601, a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy and Mr. Jackson has been set up for the purpose of taking testimony.

Do you have a witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Harold T. Woerner.

Mr. JACKSON. At this time let the record show the committee will recess until 10:30.

(Thereupon, at 10:07 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 10:36 a. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, and Gordon H. Scherer.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Woerner.

Mr. JACKSON. Raise your right hand, sir.

Mr. Woerner, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WOERNER. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Be seated, Mr. Woerner.

Are you accompanied by counsel and, if so, will counsel state his name and address for the record?

Mr. REIN. David Rein—R-e-i-n—711 14th Street NW.

# TESTIMONY OF HAROLD T. WOERNER, JR., ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID REIN

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Woerner, would you state your full name and present address?

Mr. WOERNER. My name is Harold T. Woerner, Jr., 8450 Boulevard East, North Bergen, N. J.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Counsel, the record will show at this point that Mr. Scherer of Ohio is also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, Mr. Woerner?

Mr. WOERNER. In New York City, 1926.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you briefly outline your educational background, starting with your college education?

Mr. WOERNER. Starting with my college education?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, start with your lower education, if you wish.

Mr. WOERNER. Well, I attended a parochial grade school, a parochial high school, 1 year at Dartmouth College and I graduated from Yale University.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you graduate from Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. In June 1948.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you set forth for the subcommittee any organizations—fraternal, social, scientific, veteran, or otherwise—in which you have held or now hold membership?

Mr. WOERNER. Well—

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your memory, of course.

Mr. WOERNER. I think, sir, that I would decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment, which states that I do not have to answer questions that may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are declining to answer on the fifth amendment and you are specifically raising the privilege under the fifth amendment?

Mr. WOERNER. Under the self-incrimination; yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of the fifth amendment?

Mr. WOERNER. Of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you outline your occupational background?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir. I have worked as a salesman for an oil burner—oil-burning concern. We—the firm manufactures oil burners. I worked in the sales department and as a salesman for this type of equipment for the last—well, since graduating from college.

Mr. KUNZIG. Since graduation, which was June 1948?

Mr. WOERNER. That's right, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is the name of the company that you work for?

Mr. WOERNER. The name is Hauck Manufacturing Co.

Mr. KUNZIG. H-a-u-c-k?

Mr. WOERNER. That's right, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. And the address, or the city in which—

Mr. WOERNER. It is in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. Brooklyn, N. Y.

Did you have any military service?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir; I was in the Navy for 2 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

In what capacity?

Mr. WOERNER. I was a—let me see how to put it—I enlisted in the Navy aviation-training program in 1944. I was sent to Dartmouth

College under this Navy flight-training program and then was transferred into the class V-12 for officer-candidate training, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you become an officer?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir; I didn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there any particular reason or just the end of it?

Mr. WOERNER. The end of the program before I reached the end of the program.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Woerner, when you attended Yale University did you ever participate in Marxist study groups at the university?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds stated above.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that also, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. As has been testified before this committee, we have testimony to the effect that there was at Yale University a youth group or youth cell of the Communist Party and that various young students were members of this group. Were you a member of this group?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds. It is the same question you asked previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Arthur Levy at Yale University when you were there?

Mr. WOERNER. I don't—I can't testify as to the first name. I knew a person we called Art Levy, which may be the same person; yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir——

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know——

Mr. WOERNER (continuing). On the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Theodore Polumbaum, who testified here a few days ago before this committee, while you were at Yale University?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that as well, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. I am just asking you whether you knew him.

Mr. WOERNER. And I answered that I am declining to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a question the witness should be directed to answer because it deals only with whether or not he knew the person named in the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. In line with the previous answer to the identification immediately preceding, the Chair directs that the witness answer the question as to whether or not he knew this individual.

(At this point Mr. Woerner conferred with Mr. Rein.)

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds stated above.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that question as well, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Paul Zilsel, when you were at Yale, who testified before this committee a few days ago—Z-i-l-s-e-l, I believe it is?

Mr. WOERNER. I think, sir, I have—I would decline to answer whether I knew that individual on the grounds that I have previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you give us the names of 1 or 2 of your professors at Yale while you were there?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir, if you'll allow me just a moment to recollect. I haven't thought in terms of my professors in at least 5 years.

Mr. JACKSON. The record should show that in answer to this question no connotation attaches to the naming of individuals in response to this question.

Mr. SCHERER. That's correct. I just wanted to see if there was any hesitation in his telling us who some of his professors were.

I will withdraw the question.

Mr. JACKSON. The question is withdrawn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Woerner, did you know a Joe Cort—C-o-r-t—when you were at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. I think I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds stated above.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you so decline—

Mr. WOERNER. I do.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). As distinguished between you think you do and—

Mr. WOERNER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Jerry Brown—B-r-o-w-n—while you were at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. Again, sir, I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Mike Russo—R-u-s-s-o—when you were at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. Again, sir, I decline to answer on the grounds stated above.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Ben Dontzin—D-o-n-t-z-i-n—while you were at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that, sir, on the same grounds stated above.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ben Dontzin to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds stated above.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have one more question, Mr. Woerner: When you were served a subpoena by the investigator of this committee, did you at that time state to him that you would be willing to cooperate with the committee and to testify to everything that you knew with regard to communism at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. You didn't indicate in any way that you were going to cooperate?

Mr. WOERNER. I told this individual that I had—I would have to have time to think over the answer to such a question; that I had not been in the habit of thinking how I would react to these circumstances and, therefore, I could not give him a definite answer at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. And then you called later and said that you and another unnamed individual had agreed to do no talking about this matter whatsoever; isn't that correct?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir; it is not correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. You didn't call?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Someone called for you?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Mr. KUNZIG. Not to your knowledge.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you have a phone conversation, regardless of who did call, concerning the subject counsel has mentioned?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. To what effect?

Mr. WOERNER. I received a phone call from the investigator for the committee. He asked me what I had decided to do, and I told him that I would come down here as subpoenaed.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you did not state that you and another individual had agreed to do no talking about the matter?

Remember, you are under oath.

(At this point Mr. Woerner conferred with Mr. Rein.)

Mr. WOERNER. Would you mind repeating the question, sir—your last question.

Mr. KUNZIG. The question was whether you didn't state at that time that you would appear before the committee, and that you and another unnamed individual had agreed to do no talking about the matter whatsoever.

Mr. WOERNER. This was over the—in the telephone conversation?

Mr. KUNZIG. Either over the telephone or in a personal interview with the investigator.

Mr. WOERNER. That I and a third person—is that correct?

Mr. KUNZIG. You told the investigator that you and another person had agreed to do no talking about this matter whatsoever?

Mr. WOERNER. No, sir; that's not correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I want to make one other thing clear for the record. It is correct, isn't it, that you requested that this committee grant you a delay in appearing before this committee because of a personal matter of your own—

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). And that such was granted?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOERNER. One moment—would you like for the record just why I requested the deferment?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes. That is perfectly all right. Go right ahead. Please do.

Mr. WOERNER. It happens that my wife gave birth to a baby boy on the 15th of April. I was scheduled to be here, and I didn't think we could do both at the same time.

Mr. KUNZIG. We thought the same way and, therefore, we continued it until today.

Mr. WOERNER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any further questions, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JACKSON. The committee was very happy to meet your convenience in that regard.

Mr. CLARDY.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, counsel has asked you as to whether you knew a number of persons, and you have in most instances declined to answer. I want to ask you in a little different way, and maybe a different question: Had you ever heard of any of the individuals mentioned by counsel in his series of questions?

Mr. WOERNER. I think, sir—I take that back—I would decline to answer that question on the grounds that I have stated to counsel, except for the individual who I said that I had met and did know.

Mr. CLARDY. How many were in your various classes at Yale?

Mr. WOERNER. That varied from maybe a dozen to some of the classes where there were six or seven hundred.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you or did you at the time you were in Yale know any of the other members of the various classes in which you were a student?

Mr. WOERNER. By that, sir, I think you mean classes of the standard curriculum?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOERNER. Classes offered by the university?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, sir. I am not talking about any Communist affiliations, connections, or what have you; I am talking solely and exclusively about the classes that you attended as a student at Yale.

Now, my question is very simple: Did you then and do you now recall the names of any of those with whom you were associated as classmates?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir; of course, I can remember the names of the persons with whom I lived.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you decline to answer questions as to the identity of any of the other members of your classes, aside from those counsel has named?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir; I would.

Mr. CLARDY. You would not tell us the name of any member of any class you attended? Is that what you are trying to say to us?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you apprehend the fact that you may have known a John Smith, or someone else, in any of those classes, that by merely agreeing that you knew that person it would in some way incriminate you, regardless of the identity of that person?

Mr. WOERNER. I have no knowledge, sir, of what various individuals may or may not have done, and, regardless of in what manner I

met them, therefore, I think it best, in my personal case, to decline to answer whether I knew any individuals.

Mr. SCHERER. You were ready and willing when I asked you who your professors were to tell us who, were you not?

Mr. WOERNER. Professors, sir, are not necessarily friends. It's a student-teacher relationship, and although I may have listened to these people lecture on various topics, it was not a question of them knowing me by my first name or my knowing them by their first name, sir. Therefore, there is not the same type of relationship.

Mr. CLARDY. I was not asking for your friends. I was merely asking whether you would tell the committee of people you knew. That doesn't imply in any way that they are either your friends or not your friends.

Now, I will rephrase it just briefly: Would you, if we should ask a series of questions, give us the identity of any others of your classmates—and by "others" I mean persons other than those named by counsel—or are you just dropping the iron curtain, so to speak, and will refuse to tell us anything about anybody who attended Yale at the time you were there, except some professors? Is that your position?

Mr. WOERNER. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. CLARDY. And is it your belief at this time that if you should incautiously give us the identity of a single person that you knew there you would in some way incriminate yourself?

Mr. WOERNER. It's possible.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, I am not asking whether it is possible.

Mr. WOERNER. That is——

Mr. CLARDY. Is that your belief?

Mr. WOERNER. That is my belief.

Mr. CLARDY. I merely wanted to find out where you stand.

Now, as I understand it, you will refuse to answer any questions about any possible connections you may have with the Communist Party?

Mr. WOERNER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you belong to any of these organizations that you have heard loosely described as Communist fronts?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds I have stated to counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever engaged in any subversive activity of any kind whatsoever?

Mr. WOERNER. I would decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Where are you presently employed, Mr. Woerner?

Mr. WOERNER. At the firm, the name of which I gave before—the Hauck Manufacturing Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. JACKSON. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. KUNZIG. I know of no reason.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess, subject to the call of the chairman.

It is not anticipated there will be any additional witnesses this morning or this week.

(Whereupon, at 10:56 a. m., the hearing was recessed subject to the call of the chairman.)

# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

## (EDUCATION—PART 5)

---

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 11:05 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript), and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show, Mr. Reporter, that I have appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy of Michigan; Mr. Doyle, of California; and myself as chairman for the purposes of this hearing.

Do you have a witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William T. Parry, will you come forward, please?

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Mr. PARRY. I will take the affirmation.

Mr. VELDE. Do you solemnly, in the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, affirm that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PARRY. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM T. PARRY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, CHARLES B. FORD

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. PARRY. William T. Parry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name?

Mr. PARRY. P-a-r-r-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir; I am accompanied by Mr. Ford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FORD. Charles E. Ford—F-o-r-d—416 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, may I interrupt to ask Mr. Ford a question?

Has counsel told you the general rules of the committee with respect to the rights to consult with you—

Mr. FORD. Yes; I think I understand them. They shall be obeyed.

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Clardy, I think it should be put in the record at this point that you have asked the counsel, Mr. Tavenner, to state the rules and customs under which we operate as far as counsel is concerned and the witness is concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been the rule and policy of the committee to encourage every witness to be accompanied by counsel and to consult with counsel at any time during the course of the hearing that he so desires, but it has also been the rule of the committee that counsel confine his activity to the direct assistance of the witness by conference, and questions are not permitted by counsel and arguments on matters are not permitted by counsel; but the committee will receive and consider any motion that counsel desires to make in writing.

Mr. CLARDY. And if it becomes necessary to have some recess or some interval, the committee permits the witness to ask that. If you feel it is necessary, you can advise the witness to that effect.

Mr. FORD. All right. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Parry?

Mr. PARRY. Well, I was born in Nutley, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. PARRY. Nutley—N-u-t-l-e-y—New Jersey, October 22, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. PARRY. I am a college teacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where are you a teacher?

Mr. PARRY. At the University of Buffalo.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the field in which you teach?

Mr. PARRY. I am in the department of philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. PARRY. I am in the department of philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, in a general way, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. PARRY. Well, I graduated from Columbia University, and have an A. B. from Columbia—

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. PARRY. In 1928; a master of arts from Harvard University in 1930; doctor of philosophy, Harvard University, 1932. I also did studying after my doctor's degree; had a traveling fellowship abroad for 1 year. I did further graduate work there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged in any profession since the completion of your formal education, other than the teaching profession?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has that been, and where?

Mr. PARRY. I've had several—there have been several things.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you tell the committee, please, what they are?

Let us—

Mr. PARRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Begin this way: Suppose you begin and tell us chronologically what your employment has been since you received your doctor's degree in 1932 at Harvard University.

Mr. PARRY. Well, the first employment after that—not immediately—the first employment was as an assistant in philosophy at Harvard University.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin and when did that work terminate?

Mr. PARRY. I believe that began in 1933. I'm not—not absolutely sure of the exact date, but I would say it was 1933, and I believe it terminated in 1937 or thereabouts—about that period, I would say.

An assistant in philosophy at Harvard—

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest, Witness, this room has terrible acoustics. If we could keep you a little closer to the microphone, it would be a little easier to hear. It is very difficult up here.

Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right then, begin in 1937 and tell us your employment since that time.

Mr. PARRY. I'd like to consult my attorney before answering that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, are you ready?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARRY. The period approximately 1937 to 1938 I must decline to answer as to my employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living during that period of time?

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. VELDE. You may consult.

Mr. PARRY. May I consult my attorney?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, I'm ready to answer that question. I was living in Boston at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in Boston?

Mr. PARRY. In Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. At what address in Boston?

Mr. PARRY. As to the—as to the address in Boston, I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what ground do you decline to answer?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer—

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, may I interrupt you before you—

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Let the witness finish his answer.

Mr. CLARDY. I want to make—

Mr. VELDE. Counsel has asked him for his reason.

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds that the answer might tend to incriminate me, and assert the privileges of the fifth article of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the basis for your refusal to answer the question as to how you were employed during that period between 1937 and 1938?

Mr. PARRY. It is my understanding, sir, I don't have to explain the basis of my refusal. That would destroy the purpose of the protection, the constitutional protection, if I explained the basis of my refusal to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. That——

Mr. CLARDY. May I say something?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, as I understand the question, all that was sought was the address of your residence.

Now, you do have the right to raise the fifth amendment always if it will in any way cause you, as the amendment in effect says, to testify against yourself in a criminal proceeding; but you do not have the right to raise that in a frivolous manner or without any solid foundation, and so long as there is no implication—and there definitely wasn't—that would tie you up with any criminal act of any kind, I think you should reconsider and give to the committee the address of your home.

Obviously, if there is in the background some evidence that this particular place was used for some subversive purpose or activity, you would be within your rights; but there is no insinuation or even hint by this committee that that was the case. We are merely seeking to discover where you lived.

I would like to have you reconsider it, if you will, and give us that information.

Mr. PARRY. Well, my attorney and I both are of the opinion that to disclose the address would—might, in fact, be a link in the chain of evidence leading to a criminal prosecution.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it might if in the background there is some evidence that the location was used for some criminal activity, some subversive activity of some kind; but unless you want to leave that impression that there was such, you should not raise that. If you are sure in your own mind that there is something that took place at that location that might come to the attention of the committee that would incriminate you, obviously you would have the right to raise it; but otherwise not.

Mr. PARRY. Well, in my opinion, there are other possible alternatives than the one you suggested; but I don't think I am required to state which of various possible alternatives is the actual one because that would destroy the privilege.

I can't prevent your making inferences, of course. I only say I think there are other alternatives than the one you mentioned.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, the committee has the right to discover whether or not the privilege was invoked in good faith. That is the reason I made my suggestion. If you don't follow it—that is, of course, up to you—the consequences that may be visited upon you would be the direct result of your own actions, not that of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee, please, what your employment has been since 1938?

Mr. PARRY. I was employed—the next employment was—was in the WPA on a writers' project; and subsequent to that my employment was in a furniture factory in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the exact nature of your employment with the WPA?

Mr. PARRY. I was employed in the writer's project.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your duties as an employee under the writers' project? Did you hold an administrative position—

Mr. PARRY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or were you engaged in writing?

Mr. PARRY. I was engaged in writing.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general nature of your assignment?

Mr. PARRY. Well, the project was preparing—was preparing books for publication, and I was to work on these. The particular thing I worked on was never published, as far as I know. I worked mostly on a book they were going to get out on nationalities in Massachusetts. I worked—for instance, the—I think most of my time was spent in the study of the Indians in Massachusetts, and I wrote on that subject; but as far as I know that was never—never published.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that is enough in detail.

Then your next employment was with a furniture manufacturer?

Mr. PARRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that employment cease?

Mr. PARRY. Well, that ceased sometime in 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you employed by the furniture manufacturer?

Mr. PARRY. Well, roughly about a year. I can't—I can't remember the exact length of time. About a year; roughly a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then how long were you with the WPA?

Mr. PARRY. Well, I—let me think, now. This is so far back. It's hard to remember these questions of dates here. I will have to try to refresh my recollection on this.

I—I would say for about—that was about 2 years, approximately, in the WPA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live in Boston during the entire period you were employed by the WPA and the furniture-manufacturing company?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you went into the United States Army during 1942, did you not?

Mr. PARRY. That is true, sir. I volunteered for the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the military service?

Mr. PARRY. I was in over 3 years. I think 3 years and between 4 and 5 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then when you returned what employment did you obtain?

Mr. PARRY. My first position was with an organization in New York City called the International Auxiliary Language Association.

Mr. VELDE. I'm sorry. I didn't—

Mr. PARRY. The International Auxiliary Language Association—incorporated organization of New York State.

And the next employment, soon after, was with Hunter College. There were two jobs there. I was employed in the evening session of Hunter College; also with a guidance—a counseling service for veterans, which was conducted by Hunter College for the—for the Veterans' Administration. I was employed by Hunter College.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that employment begin and end?

Mr. PARRY. Well, I—well, now, let me think. I—as I remember, I was discharged from the Army about—about December 1945. This

employment began sometime—well, the—all these 3 jobs I've spoken of—that is, the 2 jobs I've spoken of—all in a period of 1946—up to December 1946. So, they were all within a period of less than a year. I should say this employment for the association, for the Hunter College was all within 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what was your next employment?

Mr. PARRY. My next employment was at the present university.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is what university?

Mr. PARRY. University of Buffalo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. PARRY. I reside in Buffalo—Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. VELDE. Buffalo is a fairly large city. Would you give us the street address?

Mr. PARRY. I live at 144 Englewood, Buffalo—144 Englewood Avenue.

Mr. VELDE. Now, you are willing to give us the street address, residence, at the present time. As I understand it, you refuse to give your residence and the street address of your residence when you were in Boston; is that right?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Professor Parry, during the course of the investigation that has been conducted by this committee as to the purposes of the Communist Party in attempting to organize persons within the teaching profession at Harvard University and at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and also for the purpose of determining just what the Communist Party objectives were in doing that, and also for the purpose of determining the extent of success or failure of the Communist Party in that enterprise, the committee has learned that you were affiliated with that same group. It appears in the testimony of Dr. Robert Gorham Davis, who testified before this committee on February 25, 1953. He told the committee that two persons took part in his recruitment into the Communist Party, and that you were one of those. At the time he did not know you were a member of the party, but after he himself became a member he ascertained that you were a member of the party.

Now, if that be true, you are in a position to give this committee information within your knowledge of the things it is inquiring into.

So, I want to begin by asking you whether or not the testimony of Dr. Davis was true or whether it was false that you were a member of the Communist Party at Harvard University.

Mr. PARRY. Is that your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. PARRY. Well, that question, with regard to the truth of the testimony of—of the—the reluctant informer, Mr. Davis, I decline to answer on two grounds: The first and principal—principal ground is that I assert the privilege against self-incrimination and, secondly, it appears to me, although I haven't consulted counsel on this specific point—it appears to me—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest you do consult counsel.

Mr. VELDE. You may at any time consult counsel.

(At this point Mr. Parry consulted with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, I'll continue my answer, having consulted counsel.

As I say, the first and principal reason is that of the fifth article in the Bill of Rights. The second reason is that I—I believe, since I

have not had the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Davis, that I have a right under the sixth—sixth article of the Bill of Rights to refuse to answer.

Mr. VELDE. What questions would you ask Mr. Davis if you had the privilege of cross-examination here?

I want to state for your own benefit and for the benefit of counsel this is not a court of law. This is an investigating committee. It is a legislative committee, authorized by the House of Representatives, and we are out, dutybound, to ascertain facts and information relative to subversive activities in the United States, report to Congress, report to the American people, for remedial legislation.

I ask you again to reconsider your answer to that question, and to, if you can see it within your own conscience, with your own rights under the Constitution, answer the question and give us the information that you have.

Obviously, you were a member of the Communist Party at Harvard. There is no reason why you shouldn't tell us about it.

Mr. PARRY. Well, sir, I think the answer—the question whether I knew the informer, Davis, would tend to degrade and incriminate me, and I also do think that—that a congressional hearing should at least—at least morally, if not legally—I am not prepared to judge the law—should grant the right of cross-examination. Whether it is a legal right or not, I suppose, is for the Supreme Court to ultimately decide; but, to me, it seems the justice—the fifth article of the Bill of Rights speaks specifically about criminal cases, but has been extended to cover congressional hearings. So, in my non—nonlegal opinion the sixth article could be interpreted in the same spirit.

Mr. CLARDY. You misinterpret, but at any rate the question the chairman asked you hasn't been answered. He asked you that if you were permitted to do something our rules do not authorize—and that is to cross-examine Mr. Davis—what subject or what questions did you want to ask him.

Mr. PARRY. Well, that seems to me to be a very “iffy” question, as the late President Roosevelt would say, and I would have to prepare—I would prepare for that particular contingency when it arose—would prepare my questions then—but I am not prepared to ask them in a vacuum.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you knew when you came here today that the rules of this committee did not permit the procedure you are talking about, and you made no effort to explore the subject of what you would ask at all, then?

Mr. PARRY. Well, sir, you may—you know I made an effort by means of a letter I wrote to you to explore the possibility of testifying without informing on people, and your committee has denied me that right. It's quite true I didn't explore every possible contingency that might arise.

Mr. VELDE. This committee has not denied you any right whatsoever. Let's get that straight right here and now. You have every right that any other American citizen has, and we haven't denied you any right whatsoever that you have under the Constitution.

I might say, too, to the witness: An executive meeting is being held with reference to several of the witnesses who have appeared before this committee who refused to answer questions which are purely in the interests of the work of this committee with a view of citing these

witnesses for contempt, and I ask you that you really seriously consider this proposition because there is no reason under the sun that I can think of why you should not give us the information relative to the subversive activities or relative to your connections with the Communist Party or any other subversive activity.

Mr. DOYLE. May I make this observation, Mr. Chairman: I think we ought to call the attention of the witness to the fact that it would be absolutely impossible for us, as a practical matter, to arrange for cross-examination—not that we wouldn't wish that it might be otherwise and not that we don't recognize the value, the appropriateness, of cross-examination in a court proceeding; and I, as a member of the bar, for many years active in practice before I came to Congress several years ago, would still wish that there might be opportunities for cross-examination—but, Professor, if we tried to arrange that, the committee's investigations would be stymied and we would never get anywhere along the line of our assigned duties.

So, I just wanted to mention that it isn't that we, as American Congressmen, think less of the privilege or right of cross-examination than you do. We have tried for years to work out some practical plan where it might be favorably considered, but we can't, any more than we can work out some practical plan where a distinguished counsel, such as you have by your side today, could be permitted to orally argue your case. However, with all due respect to members of the bar, of which I am one, it just would foreclose our making reasonable progress in our work.

I just wanted you to understand, as a distinguished man in education, therefore, in view of your claiming your privilege under the Constitution, that we don't place less value on those things than you do; but from a practical standpoint, under our assignment, this not being a court and having need to make rapid progress in our investigation. Those are some of the reasons, fundamentally, why there is no cross-examination, and can't be, and why we can't permit counsel to have the privilege we wish he could have, always to speak out audibly in this hearing for his client.

Does that make it a little bit more clear to you?

Mr. VELDE. Let me say, Mr. Doyle, that I certainly concur with you in every statement with the exception of this witness being a distinguished professor. I think he would distinguish himself if he would answer the questions that are put to him by counsel and members of the committee. However, at this point I disagree with you that he is—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). A distinguished professor.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to your observation, I think any man who has the privilege of going to Harvard and graduating from Harvard University is certainly, in the way I used the term, a man of distinguished status in the field of education. From that standpoint, I refer to this citizen in that way.

Mr. VELDE. Well, then, let me add, too, to your remarks that, in my experience as a member of this committee, I have never heard or found any witness who has come before this committee who has incriminated himself by answering questions truthfully.

It is true there have been a number who have incriminated themselves by refusing to answer; there have been a number who have

been incriminated by committing perjury before this committee, but never has anyone been incriminated by coming before this committee and answering the questions that are asked of him truthfully.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

MR. TAVENNER. Professor, you assigned as one of your reasons for refusing to answer the question that to do so might tend to degrade you. Now, I do not know how much importance you were giving to that, if you were giving any importance to that assignment. The Supreme Court of the United States has clearly held that that is no ground for the refusal—no legal ground for refusal—to answer a question of this kind.

So, I again want to ask you, in light of that statement, which you may consult your counsel about, whether or not you would be willing to answer the question.

Incidentally, that was in the case of Brown against Walker, decided, I think, a little prior to 1900.

MR. PARRY. Well, since you suggest it, I will consult my counsel.

MR. VELDE. I think at this point we should declare a recess so that the witness and counsel may consult together for a little while.

We will be in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:50 a. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 11:48 a. m.)

MR. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

MR. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you again, after the recess, whether or not the statement made by Dr. Gorham—

MR. PARRY. Who?

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). In identifying you as a member—

MR. PARRY. Dr. who?

MR. TAVENNER. Dr. Gorham Davis.

Wait a minute—I haven't given you the full name—Dr. Robert Gorham—G-o-r-h-a-m—Davis—(continuing with the question) was true or false in identifying you as a member of the Communist Party unit in Harvard?

MR. PARRY. I stand by what I said to that question the first time you asked it.

MR. VELDE. What is that? Will you repeat again, Mr. Witness?

MR. PARRY. I—yes, sir. I decline to answer the question as to the informer, Davis, on two grounds: First, the principal ground is that I believe the answer to that question might tend to incriminate and degrade me and, therefore, I assert principal—I assert the privilege against self-incrimination in accordance with the fifth article of the Bill of Rights, which was introduced to protect the innocent; and, secondly, I also—I do also believe that I have not had the right of cross examination of Mr. Davis.

MR. TAVENNER. Not understanding fully just what importance you put upon these various assignments of grounds for your refusal to answer, I want to ask you the question in this form: Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time while you attended Harvard University?

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

MR. PARRY. Well, I attended as a student—

You mean as a student?

MR. TAVENNER. Let us put it that way first—while you attended as a student.

MR. PARRY. Well, speaking of the period before I obtained my Ph. D. degree—the period before I obtained my Ph. D. degree from Harvard—I can answer that I was not a member of the Communist Party.

MR. CLARDY. I didn't hear the concluding part of that.

MR. PARRY. I was not a member of the Communist Party—

MR. TAVENNER. And it would be—

MR. PARRY (continuing). At that time.

MR. TAVENNER. You entered Harvard in 1930; you received your doctor's degree in 1932—

MR. PARRY. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). According to my recollection from your testimony.

MR. PARRY. Yes, sir.

I was not actually in attendance at the university at the time I obtained the doctor's degree. I was on a traveling fellowship at that time.

MR. TAVENNER. Then, you were an assistant in philosophy from 1933 to 1937. That is true, isn't it?

MR. PARRY. There or thereabouts; approximately that time.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, were you a member of the Communist Party during that period of time, between 1933 and 1937?

MR. PARRY. That—on that question, I decline to answer; I claim the privilege against self-incrimination.

MR. TAVENNER. Was there any period during that time, between 1933 and 1937, when you were not a member of the Communist Party?

MR. PARRY. I claim the privilege, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, during the year 1933, to be more specific—

MR. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Tavenner.

You claim the privilege?

MR. PARRY. I claim the privilege.

MR. VELDE. And refuse to answer?

MR. PARRY. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. To be a little more specific, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1933?

MR. PARRY. I decline to answer on the same grounds—that is, on the grounds of the—of the fifth article of the Bill of Rights.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, while you were a student at Harvard—that is, between 1930 and 1932—were you a member of the Young Communist League?

MR. PARRY. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Young Communist League at any time between 1933 and 1937 when you were an assistant in philosophy, that is, an assistant instructor—

MR. PARRY. Assistant.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). In philosophy?

MR. PARRY. Assistant is the title.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, you mean an assistant professor?

MR. PARRY. No, sir; not an assistant professor. An assistant. The lowest form of academic life is the assistant, and that was—

MR. TAVENNER. Well, an assistant in teaching?

Mr. PARRY. You wish to know my duties as an assistant? Is that the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we would like to know—of course, we know you were not an assistant coach—

Mr. PARRY. I was not an assistant professor, sir. That was not my rank. I was an assistant—plain assistant.

Mr. CLARDY. What counsel is seeking to find out is, What were you assisting at? What were you teaching?

Mr. PARRY. I was assistant in the philosophy department, if that is what you—

Mr. TAVENNER. In teaching philosophy and conducting the courses in philosophy?

Mr. PARRY. I didn't conduct a course. I didn't conduct a course there. I would conduct sections of the course sometimes, but I didn't conduct a course. I graded papers, but I wasn't in charge of the course.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it fair to say you taught classes?

Mr. PARRY. Well, there's some possible ambiguity there.

The point is, the classes were large classes, where a professor would give—would have them divided once a week into sections, and I would—I would sometimes take charge of some of these sections, under the general guidance of the professor, but I didn't have charge of a course. I didn't have charge of any course. I was not in charge of any course, but I was under the direction of a professor. I might conduct these sections in a class, in which the—in which the lecture would be explained, recitations, and so on.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you operated as anyone you have described as the lowest form of academic life, an assistant—you acted as any assistant—acts in any school or college, didn't you?

I am a little familiar with it. While I was in law school at the university, I was an assistant over in the literary college. So, I am slightly familiar with it.

Now, you operated just as they do generally, didn't you?

Mr. PARRY. I believe I operated in the general manner of assistants—at least—

Mr. CLARDY. That is the idea.

Mr. PARRY (continuing). Such as the institution at Harvard.

Mr. CLARDY. I understand the distinction between assistant, assistant professor, and all that. You were just a plain assistant—period?

Mr. PARRY. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, during the period you were such an assistant, were you a member of the Young Communist League at any time during that period?

Mr. PARRY. I would like to consult my attorney before answering that.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, that question I must also decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Professor Parry, a witness testified under oath before this committee that he was a member of the Young Communist League as early as 1934 and a man by the name of Harry Marks—M-a-r-k-s—was the head of the group and that the meetings were

held at the home of Bill Parry—P-a-r-r-y—and that Bill Parry lived in a rooming house.

Were any meetings of the Young Communist League held at your home in 1934—

Mr. PARRY. I decline—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or thereafter?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that you refused to testify a few moments ago as to where you resided between 1933 and 1937 due to the fact that Communist Party meetings were held in your home?

Mr. PARRY. No, sir; that is not a fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. PARRY. That is not my understanding of it. I refused to testify as to my address—address in Boston.

Mr. SCHERER. Was it because Communist Party meetings were being held at that address?

Mr. PARRY. I don't have to explain the reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, if you—

Mr. PARRY. The reason was explained at that time.

Mr. SCHERER. If you decline to answer, you have the right to decline; but I am asking the question, sir—

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Is that the reason you declined to give the Boston address, because Communist Party meetings were held at that address?

Mr. PARRY. I don't think, sir, it would be wise for me to explain the reason—the reason why—

Mr. CLARDY. Witness—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Mr. PARRY (continuing). The reason why I decline.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer has the floor.

Mr. SCHERER. You decline?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds that it might tend—my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Herbert Ellis Robbins—R-o-b-b-i-n-s?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Harry Marks?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an investigator of this committee, Mr. George E. Cooper, who is sitting to my left?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Cooper serve the subpoena on you for your appearance at this hearing?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the date?

Mr. PARRY. Well, I think the date was May 9, sir, this year.

Mr. TAVENNER. On examination of the subpoena I find that it was served, according to the return thereon, on May 8, 1953. Is that in accordance with your recollection?

Mr. PARRY. Well, sir, I can identify the date in this way: I can identify the day. It was the same day the university issued a statement of policy to its faculty. I am sure of that, and I can say this

also on the date: It was a Friday. Now, if Friday was the 8th, I will agree it was the 8th; but if Friday was the 9th, I would say the subpoena was served on the 9th.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall talking to Mr. Cooper on that occasion and, in the course of your conversation, that you admitted to him that you belonged to the Communist Party at Harvard?

Mr. PARRY. Well, that seems to be another way of getting me to answer the question I declined to answer.

I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask that the witness be directed to answer the question. I think there is no basis whatsoever for raising the fifth amendment in that circumstance.

Mr. VELDE. The Chair concurs with the gentleman from Michigan. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. PARRY. May I have the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you repeat the question, please, sir?

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Do you recall talking to Mr. Cooper on that occasion and, in the course of your conversation, that you admitted to him that you belonged to the Communist Party at Harvard?

Mr. PARRY. I would like to consult my attorney before answering that question.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, I decline to answer the question on the grounds of self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you asked the question by Mr. Cooper as to whether you knew Isadore Amdur, Norman Levinson, Robert G. Davis, and Dirk J. Struik—S-t-r-u-i-k—to which you replied that you did and you admitted attending meetings with them?

Mr. PARRY. My understanding is Mr. Cooper asserts that I said I attended meetings with all of those names—

Mr. TAVENNER. With Isadore Amdur, Norman Levinson—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Counsel. Let the witness finish his answer.

Mr. PARRY. I think I finished—with all the individuals you named?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I'm sorry. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. At this point it is going to be necessary for the members of the committee to answer a rollcall,<sup>1</sup> and the committee will be in recess for 20 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 12:25 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 12:51 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Parry, so much time has elapsed since the asking of the question I will reask it and break it down somewhat.

<sup>1</sup> Rollcall vote on floor of House of Representatives.

Did Mr. Cooper, on the occasion mentioned, ask you if you knew Isadore Amdur, Norman Levinson, Robert G. Davis, and Dirk J. Struik?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you reply to his question by saying that you did know them and that you admitted to him having attended meetings with them?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that he be directed to answer that question.

Mr. VELDE. Will you repeat the question, please?

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

And did you reply to his question by saying that you did know them and that you admitted to him having attended meetings with them?

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I can see no way in which the answer to that question might tend to incriminate you, and you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. PARRY. Sir, you said I was directed to answer?

Mr. VELDE. That is right.

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Witness, are you aware of the fact that when the chairman directs you to answer a question it is the considered judgment of the committee that your refusal to do so may place you in contempt and place you in a position where the attorney sitting on your right there may find himself with a considerable bit of litigation?

Now, I think you better take that into account and reconsider it. You have been directed—not just asked, but directed—to answer that question.

Will you reconsider and answer?

Mr. PARRY. I will consult my attorney.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer the question on the grounds stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you not further state to Mr. Cooper, on the occasion mentioned, that you would answer any direct questions from the committee as to what part you took while you were a member of the party, but you did not believe in volunteering any information that would assist the committee?

Mr. PARRY. I'll consult with my attorney.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. VELDE. Before you answer the question, I want to concur in the statement Mr. Clardy of Michigan just made relative to a possibility of your getting into litigation and having need for counsel.

I just want to make this remark for the record: Perhaps counsel is very willing to get into this type of litigation—and I hope that I am not inferring by any means that counsel is unethical or in any way interested in obtaining a lawsuit.

Mr. DOYLE. I think this, Mr. Chairman: Counsel is here and, under our rules, he can't speak—

Mr. VELDE. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And I cherish the opinion of my distinguished chairman, but I don't think we ought to directly or indirectly

infer that, when a witness consults his counsel and then answers, there is any thought at any level that the witness shouldn't answer except and exactly as his counsel advises him.

Now, in my book that is the reason counsel is here, and I just feel impelled to make this observation here: That this counsel can't say a word in answer to the distinguished chairman's statement——

Mr. VELDE. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And I know——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle, I am sure you are right about it, and I wish to withdraw my remarks concerning the last statement I made concerning counsel for the witness.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, to get back to the thing I started with—and I don't think there was any intention on my part or that of the chairman to make any statement applying to the counsel—we are merely advising the witness he may find himself in considerable difficulty.

But, witness, may I point out to you: You have not only stated verbally the things that are being asked you by counsel, but you have placed the essence of it in writing in a communication to the committee.

I don't know whether you have advised your attorney of that fact or not, but having taken the steps that you have—and the committee intends to present evidence to show that is the fact—I don't think I would be performing my function as a member of this committee if I didn't warn you at this juncture that you are in grave threat of having the committee take some action, if the majority believes, as I do, that this is contempt of this committee. Having admitted the facts about which you are being interrogated, your refusal now is the worst kind of contempt——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And I think that should be called to your attention——

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. Mr. Clardy has the floor.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And I think the fact that you have placed these things in writing, as well as having made the statement, should be called to your counsel's attention so that he may advise you further and you be given an opportunity to reconsider.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Again I feel impelled to differ with my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. On what grounds, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. On the grounds this witness is here with his counsel and, in our questioning, I think we ought to assume the counsel is fully informed on what the witness has done——

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Doyle——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Before he comes before a committee, and I think we ought to hesitate pretty carefully to stress to the witness' attention that there should be fear on his part of a contempt proceeding. I think that is one of the last things we should do when a witness is present, or otherwise—whether he is in the room with his counsel or not. I think it is a——

Mr. SCHERER. Have you read his letter to the committee, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it would be enlightening if you did.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, gentlemen—and I don't like to disagree with my distinguished colleagues in public session—and, yet, I—and it is the first time I have—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). I must say—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). May I say this—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). I think—

Mr. VELDE. Well, just a minute.

Mr. DOYLE. I think the thought of stress of fear of prosecution for contempt to a witness like this, with his counsel present—or even if his counsel weren't present, it would be worse—

Mr. VELDE. I think these are matters we should take up in executive session, Mr. Doyle,—

Mr. DOYLE. I grant you.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And let's proceed with the hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. I grant you, but I would like the record to show in this sort of situation I can't be silent because I don't agree with it.

Mr. CLARDY. Before we—

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Clardy—

Mr. CLARDY. Just this observation, Mr. Chairman: I agree with Mr. Doyle. It is the last thing that should be raised; but, when all other means at our command are of no avail, I think we have a duty, in fairness to the witnesses, to explain to them their course of action and that their actions are probably placing them in jeopardy. I think we would be remiss in our duty if we did not.

Mr. VELDE. And especially—

Mr. CLARDY. All I am doing is calling it to his attention.

Mr. VELDE. And especially where a counsel for the witness doesn't have the right to get up—

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And argue his witness' case, I think it is obligatory—

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To tell the witness—

Mr. CLARDY. I am never going to take it for granted.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). The legal situation as much as we possibly can.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. VELDE. Now, let's proceed with the questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Professor Parry—

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Counsel—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer—

Mr. SCHERER. I am just getting back to the question. I am not going to discuss the other matter.

I think the counsel should have that last question repeated again, instead of going on to another one. There has been no answer to that last question. The witness did not even decline to answer that last question. Let's hear the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question, please, sir?

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Did you not further state to Mr. Cooper, on the occasion mentioned, that you would answer any direct questions from the committee as to what part you took while you were a member of the party, but that you did not believe in volunteering any information that would assist the committee?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer the question on the ground of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Parry, did you——

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you direct him to answer that question——

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). So it will make the record complete?

Mr. VELDE. Yes; in the Chair's opinion there is no way to incriminate you by answering the question. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. PARRY. I still believe that to answer questions about my conversation with Mr. Cooper might tend to incriminate me, and I decline to answer on the ground of the privilege——

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Parry, did you also state to Mr. Cooper, on the occasion mentioned, that you dropped out of the party when you went into the service in 1942 and never rejoined it?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the ground of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. VELDE. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. PARRY. I decline on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that you were discharged from the Army in December of 1945. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since 1945?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. VELDE. And again you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. PARRY. I decline on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Parry, did you become a member of the American Federation of Teachers at any time while you were at Harvard University?

Mr. PARRY. Did I become a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, or the local which was in existence at that institution.

Mr. PARRY. I would like to consult my attorney on that question. (At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Sir, I am ready to answer.

Yes; I was a member of a teachers—teachers' union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party, to your knowledge, endeavor to influence or control the activities of that organization while you were a member?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the ground of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. VELDE. Again you are directed to answer the question, Mr. Witness.

Mr. PARRY. I decline on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy, do you have questions?

Mr. CLARDY. May I see that letter, counsel?

Witness, you addressed a communication to this committee dated May 15, 1953, didn't you?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You can see it, I take it, from here.

Do you recognize it as being the one that you signed and sent to the committee?

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir; I recognize that.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, now, without wasting any more time, isn't it a fact that in that communication you have in effect admitted the verity of the things upon which you were questioned by counsel a few moments ago, or a few minutes ago, in the series of questions he asked?

Mr. PARRY. What specifically do you mean there?

Mr. CLARDY. I mean the series of questions dealing with your connections with the Communist Party.

Mr. PARRY. Can I—

Mr. CLARDY. My question is: Isn't it a fact that this letter, in substance, is an admission of those past connections?

Mr. PARRY. May I reread the letter before answering that question?

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you.

Mr. PARRY. May I reread the letter before answering that question?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; you may read it, if you wish. I don't mean read it aloud.

Do you have a copy there?

Mr. FORD. I think this is a copy.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, in my opinion, the letter does not state what you implied. I stand by what the letter says but not by your interpretation of it.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I suggest you read—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. Mr. Clardy has the floor.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. I'm sorry.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Witness, before I read this letter in its entirety in the record, as it will be in a moment, I am asking you if it isn't a fact in this letter you have said you are willing to tell the committee the things upon which the investigator has interrogated you, but that you would not discuss names or would not bring other people into the hearing—in other words, that you were trying to impose a condition upon which you would admit the other things you have told to our investigator. Now, is that not the import of the letter?

Mr. PARRY. Not exactly.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it is in substance, isn't it?

Mr. PARRY. Not as far as the specific questions are concerned.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you.

Mr. PARRY. Not as far as the specific questions that are asked here. There was no mention in the letter of that—of any such specific organizations or individuals, or other things, that have been mentioned in the questions today.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I will read the letter to you, and then I will rephrase the questions.

Mr. VELDE. And let the record show that the witness has admitted that he wrote the letter.

Mr. CLARDY. And that this is his signature on the letter, and it is dated at 144 Englewood Avenue, Buffalo 14, N. Y., May 15, 1953, and addressed to you, Mr. Chairman (reading) :

I have been subpoenaed to appear before your committee on May 19. Before testifying, I would like to make a request.

Conscious of no wrongdoing, I am well aware that some past associations or activities might be used against me under present circumstances, in which there is widespread disrespect in high places for the bill of rights. However, in view of my desire to protect the good name of my university, I am prepared to set aside personal apprehensions, to waive my privilege of not testifying against myself, and to answer freely and frankly any relevant questions about my own activities, provided—

and that word is underlined—

that your committee agrees not to ask me to name or identify any other person, I will not play the conscious role of informer. I will not get innocent people into trouble. If I did, I would lose all self respect and forfeit the confidence of my colleagues and students. I request you, therefore, to respect my conscientious scruple, making it possible for me to waive my constitutional protection and testify more fully than I otherwise can.

Respectfully,

and signed by your name.

Now, I am going to repeat the question, sir: Is that not—

Mr. PARRY. One correction, sir, please, for the record.

Mr. CLARDY. I am going to restate my question, as I said—

Mr. PARRY. The word—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Now that I have read the letter.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Mr. PARRY. The word—I spoke of the role of odious informer, not conscious role of informer.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I haven't got my glasses on and maybe I am reading it wrong.

Mr. VELDE. Here—"odious."

Mr. CLARDY. At the very end.

Mr. PARRY. "I will not play the odious role \* \* \*"

Mr. CLARDY. You are correct. I don't know how I misread it. "I will not play the odious role \* \* \*"

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, now, to come back to my question, sir: Isn't it a fact that this letter was consciously written after you had talked with our investigator and that you intend in this letter to say to this committee that you will here, under your conditions, however, admit that you were a member of the Communist Party, admit all of the other things upon which you have been interrogated, in detail, by counsel?

Mr. PARRY. No, sir; the letter doesn't mention the Communist Party, nor the other things that—

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't say—

Mr. PARRY (continuing). Nor the other things that were mentioned here in detail.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't say the letter mentioned that, but was not this letter written consciously in an effort to tell the committee that you would admit freely and frankly all of the things about your own connections with the Communist Party if the condition you set up was observed and you were not asked about others?

Now, I am merely asking you: Isn't that the fact?

Mr. PARRY. I'll have to make a qualification on that.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, make it.

Mr. PARRY. It still remains true that the letter does not mention any specific organization, as your statement implies.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, are you admitting that aside from mentioning the Communist Party my statement is accurate and correct?

Mr. PARRY. I would have to hear it—hear it again, if it is to be—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I will put it again, because I want to be very sure on this: Isn't your letter consciously written in an effort to persuade this committee to allow you to tell about all your connections and associations on which you have been interrogated today, provided that we do not ask you to name others? Isn't that the import of the letter?

Mr. PARRY. There's still that clause in your statement—"about which I have been interrogated today." If you strike out that clause, I would—could answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. All right; we will leave that out. Will you answer it?

Mr. PARRY. Yes; with that exception I think you stated the case fairly—

Mr. CLARDY. All right, then, having made that statement, isn't it a fact that at the time you wrote the letter, and indeed right down to the very time prior to your appearance on the stand, that you were perfectly willing to tell this committee all about your past associations and connections, provided that we did not interrogate you about the identity of other persons?

Mr. PARRY. Well, what I stated in that letter is true.

Mr. CLARDY. That is the fact, isn't it?

Mr. PARRY. I meant what I said when I wrote the letter, if that is what you are asking.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you. I wish—

Mr. PARRY. I meant what I said when I wrote the letter.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, just answer my question, then: My statement of it is an accurate statement, then, isn't it?

Mr. PARRY. Well, we have so many statements of it now—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, we will put it this way: Do you still adhere to and mean what you said in your letter?

Mr. PARRY. I better consult my attorney on that.

Mr. CLARDY. You may.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, my answer is that the letter was written in good faith and I meant what I said in the letter. The letter contained a provision, and that having—that provision and the request not having been granted, the entire letter is now null and void. It is like an offer which is not accepted. The entire thing is of no effect at the present time, as far as I can see.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, I see. You thought you could bargain with the committee and not having obtained your price that what you said then would be of no importance; is that what you are trying to tell us?

Mr. PARRY. No, sir. If the offer had been accepted, the condition—the situation would now be different from what it is.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, then—

Mr. VELDE. Let me—

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Make it clear again, Mr. Witness: I told you this morning that this is not a court of law. We are obliged to ascertain facts relative to subversive activities in the United States of America, to report them to Congress for the purposes of remedial legislation.

You could, if you followed the statements that you made in your letter, be of some assistance to us——

Mr. DOYLE. I would say be of great assistance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. I agree.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Telling us your own connections with the Communist Party.

It is obvious to all of us here—and I am sure it is obvious to your own counsel—that you were a member of the Communist Party.

You should, by all means, give us the benefit of any information you have about your own activities as a member of the Communist Party. That is what we are vitally interested in at the present time. We are obligated, as I say, not only to the House of Representatives, our colleagues, but we are obligated to the American people to find out just how the Communist Party operated in this country; and, as a member of the Communist Party, you can give us some information, especially as a member of the teaching profession.

Now, proceed, Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. One final question: If the committee should at this time inform you that it will not ask you any questions about the identity of any of the persons associated with you in the testimony that we have called to your attention, but would confine our questions to asking you merely about your own actions and past associations, would you answer the questions?

Mr. PARRY. May I consult my attorney?

Mr. CLARDY. You may.

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. PARRY. Sir, my answer is that if you at this time grant the request I made in the letter, I would stand by the letter, although at the moment I feel my personal apprehensions are stronger than they were when I wrote it.

Mr. CLARDY. I don't understand your answer. You mean you would still at this juncture decline to answer the questions, even under the terms and conditions set out in your letter? Is that what you mean?

Mr. PARRY. No, sir; not——

Mr. CLARDY. Well, explain it. I didn't understand it. Your voice is muffled quite a bit with that microphone——

Mr. PARRY. I see.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And it is hard to hear.

Mr. PARRY. I have to stand by the letter. If the request were now granted. I would feel obliged to——

Mr. CLARDY. You would answer?

Mr. PARRY (continuing). To do what I stated—as I stated there.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, to answer my question directly——

Mr. PARRY. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You would answer if those terms and conditions are met?

Mr. PARRY. I would not—what the letter states in effect is that I would waive the privilege against self-incrimination. There may be some questions that might be refused on other grounds, but the letter stated, under certain conditions, I would waive the privilege against self-incrimination; and I would—I will stand by that. If the conditions set forth in the letter are now granted, I would waive the privilege against self-incrimination. It may be, however, there would be other grounds for refusing to answer certain questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, let's ask you a simple question to see if your performance would be as you indicate. If you should now be asked whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party and the terms you have suggested should be agreed to before you were asked that question, would you answer that question?

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Clardy, I think you ought to ask the question directly—if he ever has been. I don't see any reason to go any further—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, if he will answer that one question—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). In view of certain—

(At this point Mr. Clardy conferred with Mr. Velde.)

(At this point Mr. Parry conferred with Mr. Ford.)

Mr. VELDE. Well, I am afraid, Mr. Clardy, we are getting into a position where—we are by no means browbeating the witness—

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, no.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). But we are trying to put him into a position of a conjecture as to what he would do under certain circumstances; and, after all, it isn't the function of this committee to question a witness to determine what he would do under a particular set of circumstances. It is the function of this committee to determine facts.

Mr. CLARDY. I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, but I don't want to press it.

But I do want to ask him one more question based on specific testimony that has been presented.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. CLARDY. On page 7 of the report\* of the committee dealing with the February 25, 1953, hearings, Professor Davis was asked the specific question as to whether or not you were one of the first persons who interviewed him, and the question reads this way:

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you give us the name of the second person who may have been the person whom you first interviewed with regard to joining the Communist Party?

Answer by Mr. Davis: "William Parry," and he spelled it out.

My question is: Is that testimony by Mr. Davis true and correct?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer the question, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Professor Davis?

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. What is Davis' first name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Robert Gorham.

Mr. SCHERER. I had better ask that question again.

Do you know Robert Gorham Davis?

Mr. PARRY. I have already declined to answer that question, sir.

Mr. VELDE. And for the purpose of the record it is on the grounds your answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. PARRY. That was one of the grounds I gave.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you, Professor, this question: I quite assume that you are familiar with Public Law 601, under which this committee functions, are you? I mean, have you read it?

Mr. PARRY. I can't say I have read Public Law 601.

Mr. DOYLE. Public Law 601 assigns this committee to investigate the extent of subversive activities in the United States.

If you were a member of this committee, appointed by the United States Congress, how would you go about investigating the extent of subversive activities at Harvard University? Wouldn't you subpoena members of the former student body or of the faculty, past or present, and ask their cooperation in looking into the subversive activities which may have existed there? How would you go at it?

Mr. PARRY. Well, if I were——

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you critically, Professor——

Mr. PARRY. No.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Believe me.

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I am trying to get some area where you can give us some benefit of your intimate and personal knowledge.

Mr. PARRY. Well, sir, if I were a member of this committee, I would investigate the—in the kind of subversive activities that seem to me to present the greatest danger to this country at this time; and, in my opinion, communism in the universities is practically negligible at the present time, and that is not the direction in which my inquiries would look.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you may have an opinion that it is practically negligible at this time, but if you were a member of this committee, may I ask you again, wouldn't you expect a member of the Harvard faculty whom the committee has reason to believe had personal knowledge of subversive activities among the students or faculty, or at Harvard, say, just 2 or 3, 4 or 5 years ago——

Mr. PARRY. Well, I——

Mr. DOYLE. Wouldn't you expect that professor or student——

Mr. PARRY. Well, of course, I——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). To come in and cooperate with you as a member of the committee?

Mr. PARRY. Well, so far the questions are about 15 years old. I'd have to perhaps——

You are asking if I had evidence about 5 years ago? Is that the question—if I had evidence of activities about 5 years ago——

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; I——

Mr. PARRY (continuing). Wouldn't I consider it my duty as a member of the committee to look into it? Is that the question?

Well, of course, this—this assumes a condition contrary to fact—that is to say I don't have evidence—I don't have—I don't know of any evidence, for instance, at the University of Buffalo of Communist activities. So, you are asking me to assume—or as far as Harvard is concerned—of course, I haven't been around there for many years, and I haven't seen—I haven't seen evidence that there is any considerable amount of communism at either of these universities in the last 5 or 6 years. So, I still think my inquiries into the dangers—into dangers coming within the jurisdiction of the committee would be in quite different directions.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, you have said——

Mr. VELDE. Let me say, Mr. Doyle, with all due respect to your distinguished opinions and your very able questions, that I can't see the reason for asking a witness' advice when that witness refuses to give us any information whatsoever relative to our functions.

Mr. CLARDY. Speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't value that advice very highly.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I still think that even though this witness may be in your judgment where you place him, this witness, in my book, is a person who has some valuable facts and information——

Mr. VELDE. I will agree with you on that——

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Wholeheartedly.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And I am trying to arrive at a level which would be fair to him and fair to the committee in trying to see if there is a level in which this witness will voluntarily help us in the area of Communist activities at the University of Buffalo.

Now, I am not trying to ask his advice. I didn't ask his advice, excepting that I asked him what he would do if he were a member of this committee and with the assignment we have.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I consider that advice to the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, all right; I will stipulate it. It is advice. It is his opinion as to what he would do as a trained educator; but in view of the time lapsing, I will not press it any further.

Mr. SCHERER. He said the Communist activities at Buffalo were not too great at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been no evidence introduced——

Mr. VELDE. What?

Mr. SCHERER. He said that.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been no evidence introduced.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, there is evidence as to his statement.

Mr. CLARDY. I will ask the question: How do you know there is any?

Mr. PARRY. I don't know there is any.

Mr. CLARDY. Why did you give the answer you gave?

Mr. PARRY. Because I can't swear there is any.

Mr. CLARDY. And that is the only basis?

Mr. PARRY. I can say as a matter of fact, of public knowledge, it must be negligible because nobody knows about it.

Mr. VELDE. Well, since you know about or have some opinion regarding the Communist activity at Buffalo, what is your opinion about the past Communist activity at Harvard?

Mr. PARRY. About whose past activity at Harvard?

Mr. VELDE. Your own and anyone else's who was in the Communist Party with you at Harvard.

Mr. PARRY. Your question has implications which, of course, if I answered would involve me in saying something which I refused to answer. I can't answer the question as you have put it.

Mr. VELDE. You cannot answer the question?

Mr. PARRY. I believe if you directed me to answer the question as you put it I would have to refuse to answer it.

Mr. VELDE. You don't have to refuse to answer the question. You are under no compulsion——

Mr. PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). to refuse to answer the question.

Do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. PARRY. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. VELDE. Will you repeat the question, Mr. Reporter?

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Mr. VELDE. Well, since you know about or have some opinion regarding the Communist activity at Buffalo, what is your opinion about the past Communist activity at Harvard?

Mr. PARRY. About whose past activity at Harvard?

Mr. VELDE. Your own and anyone else's who was in the Communist Party with you at Harvard.

Mr. PARRY. I decline to answer on the grounds of possible incrimination—self-incrimination.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, is there any reason for continuing this witness under subpoena any longer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that the name of the university, Buffalo University, was brought in by the witness and then some questions were based on that, I think I should say that in the questions I asked I did not intend by inference or in any other way to indicate any special knowledge of Communist activities or the lack of Communist activities at Boston University.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; certainly.

Mr. PARRY. Buffalo.

Mr. TAVENNER. I meant to say at Buffalo University.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the chairman agrees with the statement of counsel we are not inferring that the Communist activity at Harvard, Buffalo, or any other university is greater than it is at—maybe I should withdraw my remarks about any other university—the Communist activity at Buffalo or Harvard is any greater than the Communist activity at any other university throughout the country.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I am correct in this—and I have watched it pretty carefully: I don't believe we have even located the university. We know the name, but we haven't located the town. I thought of it 3 or 4 times. Maybe we just better let the record remain silent on that. I don't think it mentions the town. We know, but the record I don't believe shows the town.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be retained?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock, when we will meet in executive session.

(Whereupon, at 1:35 p. m., the hearing was recessed, with the committee to reconvene in executive session at 2 p. m., of the same day.)



## COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (EDUCATION—PART 5)

---

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:38 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript), and Morgan M. Moulder (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will please come to order.

Let the record show that the chairman has set up a subcommittee composed of Mr. Clardy of Michigan, and Mr. Velde of Illinois, as a subcommittee of two for the purposes of this hearing.

Do you have a witness, Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Professor Singer, will you step forward, please? Will you stand and be sworn?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SINGER. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you are accompanied by counsel, Professor Singer, would counsel please state his name and address for the record?

Mr. POLLITT. Daniel H. Pollitt, office address 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

### TESTIMONY OF MARCUS SINGER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DANIEL H. POLLITT

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Singer, would you please state your name and address?

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt a minute, please? Would you make sure that counsel accompanying the witness is thoroughly familiar with our practices and procedures?

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly. Have you ever appeared before this committee previously?

Mr. POLLITT. No, I have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. On any committee?

Mr. POLLITT. No, I have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. The practice before this committee is that you may confer at any time with your client and that may be done privately and you may even leave the room if you so desire, but you are not permitted to talk before the subcommittee. You may talk to your witness. You may talk through your witness, through your client.

Mr. POLLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is there anything further?

Mr. VELDE. I think that is sufficient.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Singer, would you please state your name and address?

Mr. SINGER. My name is Marcus Singer. My address is 109 Iroquois Road, Ithaca, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, Professor Singer?

Mr. SINGER. August 1914, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. SINGER. I attended the public schools in Pittsburgh, Pa., until 1930. I entered the University of Pittsburgh in 1934, received a bachelor of science degree in 1938, after which I attended Harvard University from 1938 to 1942, receiving a master of arts degree in 1940 and a doctor of philosophy in 1942.

Mr. KUNZIG. That completed your formal education?

Mr. SINGER. Formal training.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you kindly give the committee a résumé of your employment background, let us say since you graduated from college?

Mr. SINGER. Between 1938 and 1942 I was a fellow, teaching fellow, at Harvard University in the biological laboratories.

In 1942 I received the position of assistant in anatomy at the Harvard Medical School, became instructor in 1944, that is instructor in anatomy and in 1945, I believe, associate in anatomy, and in 1947 assistant professor of anatomy at the Harvard Medical School.

In 1950 I taught for 2 months as a visiting professor at the Long Island College of Medicine. In 1951 I left Harvard for Cornell to become associate professor of zoology. That is my position at the present time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you associate professor of zoology today, or were you just raised to a full professor?

Mr. SINGER. I was raised to a full professor which goes into effect on July 1. Today I am an associate professor.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, when you were at Harvard, were you connected with the Communist Party group that met and among whose members were Professor Amdur, Professor Martin, and the others who have already testified before this committee from that group?

Mr. SINGER. I met with a Communist Party group when I was at Harvard, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the dates that you met with that group?

Mr. SINGER. Either late in 1940 or the beginning of 1941 through approximately in an on-and-off sequence part of the war.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. May I explain the nature of the group, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. I will ask you about that.

Mr. SINGER. Surely.

Mr. KUNZIG. I want to get clear the end date of this. I got the first date, that is you became a member of this group or participated in this group in late 1940 or early 1941. What was the end date, if there has been an end date?

Mr. SINGER. I don't remember clearly, but I would say on and off through the war years.

Mr. KUNZIG. Through the war years?

Mr. SINGER. Perhaps 1945 or 1944, or thereabouts that I attended meetings of this group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were the meetings held?

Mr. SINGER. The meetings were held at homes.

Mr. KUNZIG. At the homes of the members of the group?

Mr. SINGER. Of the members of the group.

Mr. CLARDY. How many were in that group?

Mr. SINGER. Well, the group varied, sir, from time to time.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I appreciate that. All of them didn't attend all of the meetings, but how many in the aggregate attended all the meetings, taken together?

Mr. SINGER. What I meant by varied, sir, is that for example during the war years there was very little attendance. I mean relatively little attendance than before the war years because of the movement of people away from the university, but I would roughly estimate—it is very difficult—but perhaps 7 or 8 or approximately that number would be the maximum.

Mr. CLARDY. At each meeting?

Mr. SINGER. At, say, a meeting which had the maximum. It might be 4 or 5 at another time, and so on.

Mr. CLARDY. Over a period of years the total number of different persons that would attend such a meeting would be how many?

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SINGER. At any one time, if I would estimate the total number who attended the meetings, during the years?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. That would be extremely difficult for me, but to hazard a guess, perhaps 14 or 15, something like that. It was not a disciplined group in the sense of attendance. There was no compulsion for the individual to attend or to have regular attendance because it was a group which discussed the Marxian philosophy and attempted to apply what they could from the discussions to the present day, that is, present day of that time, present-day events.

Mr. CLARDY. The idea of dialectical materialism was discussed at some length?

Mr. SINGER. Yes, we read individual books. We would take chapters for example in Karl Marx' book or in Engels' works for example, and I remember clearly, since I was very much interested in it, the Dialectics of Nature and which had a scientific application. We would take a chapter or two chapters. Each one would have a turn and he would lead the discussion within the group and there would be argument and debate and so on on the application and nature of the substance of these chapters.

For example, considering the argument and debate, for example I remember clearly a great dissension within the group on the nature of the value of objects.

Mr. CLARDY. What was that?

Mr. SINGER. About the value of any article as judged by the Marxian standard in the terms of human effort put into it, and the argument on the level of what would a painting be worth and what would an antique be worth and where it fell down or where it could not be analyzed adequately. But that was the nature of the group. We were under no compulsion within the group either in attendance. We discussed with great interest, since we all were interested in it and we were drawn into it because of our interest, the Marxian philosophy. We believed in its application.

Mr. CLARDY. You accepted the theories that Marx advanced?

Mr. SINGER. We accepted the theoretical side, with argument and debate and as you know, or may know, some of the theory is very difficult to interpret.

Mr. CLARDY. It is very turgid book. I have read a great deal of it.

Mr. SINGER. The Capital is very hard to understand. On the other hand, Dialectics of Nature I frankly and honestly enjoyed much more than I did the other because, being a scientist, I was interested in the scientific application of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. You may proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now, Professor Singer, a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. No, I am not a member of the Communist Party, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you at any time ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I considered myself a Communist.

Mr. CLARDY. You what?

Mr. SINGER. I considered myself a Communist. I supported the Communist program. I do not remember membership or a card in the Communist Party or any formal dues as such, but I contributed to the Communist Party in terms of support, in terms of money on drives when I could, in terms of their program. I was interested in it and I believed in it and consequently I considered myself as being a Communist.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you believe in it now?

Mr. SINGER. No, I do not.

Mr. CLARDY. When did you change?

Mr. SINGER. Well, I would say that I gradually went through a metamorphosis. It is hard to define the time but I would say in immediate proximity to the war years, the postwar years and the subsequent years of 1946, 1947, 1948, my interest dwindled to the point where I disassociated myself completely from leftwing organizations, from meetings, from rallies, and from any association.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you tell the committee what caused this dwindling of interest on your part?

Mr. SINGER. Well, as I look back over it, sir, there are a number of things. For one, as I went along in my career I realized that my personal talents do not lie either in the direction of politics or in the direction of economics, that my talents lie particularly within my field, and so I devoted myself more and more to research and to my family which had started then and had grown.

Too, I realized in the postwar years that here is a tremendous conflict brewing on an international level and here is an overwhelming situation to which I could not fit myself as a Marxist.

And after all my basic loyalties as I look back on them, always were and always will be with my country.

Mr. CLARDY. There was no particular event that caused a sudden change of heart or mind, but rather a series of things that gradually unpersuaded you, so to speak?

Mr. SINGER. No, I don't think it was cataclysmic, so to speak. During the war I supported wholeheartedly the international situation. It was easy to support. We were all going in the same direction. There was a brave new world to look forward to and we were all happy and it looked that way in the early years with the setting up of the United Nations. Then with the growing and intensification of the cold war, as it grew and as it became difficult I completely disassociated myself, both in interest and in actuality with leftwing organizations.

Mr. VELDE. Dr. Singer, your testimony is very interesting to this committee because the committee has and is at the present time attempting to determine how far the Communists have infiltrated especially higher education, and I believe you are giving us a very good story, a good picture as to the part that you played in such infiltration.

I am a little bit interested in what the gentleman from Michigan was questioning you about a few minutes ago, that is, the course of study that was pursued at the Communist meetings. I wonder if you would go into that a little bit more thoroughly. For example, did you study the Communist Manifesto?

Mr. SINGER. No, I had read the Communist Manifesto before then. We did not study that because I don't think we were basically interested in that. That was sort of, as you know, like an order in a direction. This was an intellectual group which liked to argue and discuss and we were used to taking things of interest for the day. For example, during the early part of the war when the Soviet Union called the war a war of national liberation, as you recall at the beginning of the war, we studied books on the problem of national liberation. We read up on it as to what they meant by national liberation.

At other times when our interest swung in one way or the other, for example at one time we studied very carefully the genetics controversy which some of us were terrifically interested in and which was brewing on an international scale. Of course, there were limits in the information because there was not much published at that time, but there was the problem of Lysenko and genetics and we took such topics as that.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you ever discuss the Soviet or the Communist Party attitude generally toward religion?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; we discussed that at one point. I do not think we had any formal reading on that because I do not recollect whether there is a formal book on that, but during the war there was a big discussion in the papers as to whether people were permitted to practice their religion within the Soviet Union or not and the press and our radio, as you know, were favorably disposed toward Russia as an ally and there were pictures of overflow crowds within the churches, as you know, and so on, but in general we did not bother much with the religious question. Most of it was what you might call heavy

stuff, the business of economic application, the business of political application, the business of scientific application of the Marxian contributions, the Engels philosophy and in terms of the scientific level.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever discuss the old saying—I believe it was Lenin's—that "Religion is an opiate of the people."

Mr. SINGER. I have heard that, but we never took that as a subject of discussion. I think we accepted that as part of our philosophical background just like we accepted many things, but it was a group which liked to argue and debate. It is sort of traditional in certain ways within scholarly levels. We do that in biology in a sense in our seminars, except that this was a Communist group. We wanted to learn it and we supported the philosophical side of communism.

Mr. VELDE. You were more or less studying and talking about the theoretical side of communism, I presume, that is the Marxian ideology, but did you ever discuss whether or not that was being carried into practice in Soviet Russia?

Mr. SINGER. Yes, that was a major part of the discussion. We would discuss the philosophical side and see what the nature of application was, either in Russia or how it was applied on an international level. You see the nature of the application of these to possible application within different countries, how the Marxian philosophy may or may not fit within these situations, and we argued on these levels and we debated on these levels, but we sympathetically applied this information to the international situation. So in that sense it was not confined to merely theoretical considerations. It was application on the theoretical level.

Mr. VELDE. Let me ask you about your conclusion at the present time with reference to the practice of Marxism in Soviet Russia. Do you believe that Soviet Russia is practicing Marxism at the present time?

Mr. SINGER. I know that there is a tremendous debate as to whether they are or whether they are not, but I do not think I am really competent to say whether they are putting into practice the economic side and I have heard arguments that they are not, on either that or the political side of the Marxist philosophy. Nor can I say about the scientific side except in my own field, and yet in a way even there I could not—one does not have to be a Marxist to be a scientist. That is obvious. You don't have to read the literature of Marxism to be a scientist.

Mr. VELDE. Were there any other subjects that you studied during your classes, or your meetings, rather, I should say?

Mr. SINGER. No, the philosophical and practical side. For example, we would read Communist literature, say American Communist literature when it was pertinent. For example, there was a monthly magazine which came out at that time.

Mr. VELDE. What was the name of the magazine?

Mr. SINGER. I can't remember whether it was called *The Communist* or something of that sort.

Mr. VELDE. There was a magazine called *The Communist*.

Mr. SINGER. Well, that would occasionally have articles by international Communists, maybe an article by a French Communist or a German Communist analyzing the world situation, so if it were in context with our studies we might devote a whole session to the analysis of this one article.

Mr. VELDE. How about the Duclos letter, the letter that Jacques Duclos sent?

Mr. SINGER. I remember that because that created quite a controversy. It was a very critical issue and resulted in a split within the party and continuous argument within the party and there were lectures on that.

I remember attending a lecture in Boston by a Communist from the New Masses who analyzed the significance of the letter, and if I recollect correctly the letter stated that the Communist Party of the United States had deviated from the traditional position of communism, that Browder was wrong, that the party should reorient itself once again along the line of international Communist philosophy and doctrines.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. Pursuing that line a little further, in your studies I take it you became acquainted with and must have accepted the basic tenet, the backbone, so to speak, of the Communist teachings, the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. You must have studied and understood and accepted that. Do you accept it today?

Mr. SINGER. No; I do not accept it today.

Mr. CLARDY. To go back to the time that you did, your group was accepting it?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; we discussed that.

Mr. CLARDY. You understood, did you not, that that meant that the end, the dictatorship of the proletariat was to be achieved, in the words of Lenin and the rest, by revolution. You knew and understood that, surely, did you not?

Mr. SINGER. No; I would say not, because we did not look at it, I am sure, and I am speaking for myself, in terms of revolutionary forces and violence. As we studied it, the concept went like this, that capitalism reaches a level of decay where it collapses on its own.

Mr. CLARDY. I know there is a theory that we will destroy ourselves. That is their theory.

Mr. SINGER. You see what I mean, and that at that time the people could take it over, as we understood it, by democratic means.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, but the word "democratic" in the Russian or the Communist dictionary doesn't mean what we mean, does it?

Mr. SINGER. That is right. Then at that time there would be revolutionary forces at work to try to maintain the system and consequently a revolution.

Mr. CLARDY. Don't they say that there will be counterrevolutionary forces to maintain, isn't that the terminology they use?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. So that as they say today they anticipate starting a war because they must anticipate the war that they are sure England and America and the rest are going to start first. Isn't that their attitude?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And wasn't that their attitude and wasn't that the angle that was discussed in your groups?

Mr. SINGER. I don't think that we ever came down to a discussion on that—at least, we did not see it on that level.

Mr. CLARDY. You may not have seen it but you must have been aware of the fact that that was the Communist theory of always striking first, on the assumption that if you didn't the other fellow was

going to hit you first, the application of the words used by a general in the Civil War of "Getting there fustest with the mostest."

Mr. SINGER. That is the Communist philosophy.

Mr. CLARDY. You accepted that, but you say that you rejected it. Do you reject it in its entirety?

Mr. SINGER. I rejected it because I cannot see at the present time any application to the United States.

Mr. CLARDY. Can you see any application anywhere?

Mr. SINGER. Of force and violence?

Mr. CLARDY. Of the theory behind the Communist doctrine. Can you see that it makes any sense whether it is in the United States or anywhere else?

Mr. SINGER. No; I do not.

Mr. CLARDY. You do not see that?

Mr. SINGER. No; I do not see that.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. CLARDY. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell this committee—

Mr. SINGER. May I interrupt? As I look back to these discussions, projecting myself back through the years and as I look back at myself I don't think I ever accepted that.

Mr. CLARDY. Accepted what?

Mr. SINGER. In terms of revolutionary violence for myself.

Mr. CLARDY. May I express this thought, it is pretty difficult for me to see how you could accept the Communist theories if you did not accept the basic tenet, and that is the absolute necessity of their taking over, so to speak, all the rest of the world.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you tell this committee how you first became a member of the Communist Party at Harvard?

Mr. SINGER. Yes. I was invited into this group on the basis that I was interested, in the sense that I did not, I think, hold back in any open discussions around the laboratory or elsewhere around the school of my own personal views of the growing international situation which worried me worse than anything. I was extremely depressed when France fell. The world looked unusually black to me in 1940.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who invited you to become a member of this group?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I feel that I am prepared to talk freely about myself, but I honestly feel that in honor and conscience I cannot, I prefer not, I should not talk about my colleagues and associates. I know that you have had before you a number of people and they have spoken freely and I have thought very carefully about this because it is a most difficult position. Yet I should not give you my feelings—

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be directed to answer the question that he has just been asked.

Mr. VELDE. In order for this committee to do its duty and perform its obligations, it is necessary that we obtain information, complete information about the Communist Party and all of its various front groups and we feel that the matter of who asked you to become a Communist is a matter which this committee is entitled to know, a fact which this committee is entitled to know, and so the witness is directed to answer that particular question.

Mr. SINGER. May I consult with my attorney?

Mr. KUNZIG. Please do.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I feel strongly and knowing these people that they were like myself, they did nothing subversive, and I also feel that should I answer this question on advice of my counsel, that this might tend to incriminate me, and for both of these reasons of honor and conscience and of incrimination I would rather not answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you tell us whether or not the person who solicited your membership was a member of the faculty at Harvard University?

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I feel I could tell you that, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. The person who solicited your affiliation and membership was a member of the faculty?

Mr. SINGER. Was on the staff of Harvard University.

Mr. VELDE. At this point, gentlemen, it is apparent that we are going to have a series of rollcalls on the floor and it will be impossible to continue this hearing today. Now, would it inconvenience the witness too greatly to return tomorrow at 10 o'clock?

Mr. SINGER. Well, it would, but I could remain.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, it is always an inconvenience. It is an inconvenience to us sometimes, too, and I suppose we will have to insist on your return at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CLARDY. And might we leave it also that we will meet at that time unless he is advised to the contrary by counsel? Something might come up today on the floor that might make it inconvenient for us to return tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

Mr. VELDE. Surely. We will recess at this time until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in this same room.

(Whereupon, at 11:16 a. m., the hearing was adjourned until 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 27, 1953.)



# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (EDUCATION—PART 5)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:15 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show, Mr. Reporter, that the chairman has appointed Mr. Clardy, Mr. Doyle, and myself as chairman of a subcommittee for the purposes of this continued hearing.

Is the witness here?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Singer.

## TESTIMONY OF MARCUS SINGER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DANIEL A. POLLITT—Resumed

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Singer, you were asked yesterday who invited you to become a member of this group. Your answer was that you would rather not answer. Now, I want to get that definitely on the record. Are you refusing to answer that question?

Mr. SINGER. I would rather not answer that, sir, in honor and conscience.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you, Mr. Singer.

Mr. SINGER. I would rather not answer. I prefer not to answer that, in honor and conscience, sir, and——

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you——

Mr. SINGER (continuing). For the reasons of incrimination, as I stated yesterday.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right. It is a question of English now. Are you refusing to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. SINGER. For that and honor and conscience, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you are refusing to answer; is that correct?

Mr. SINGER. I prefer not.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you refusing to answer?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you stated yesterday that the growing international situation worried you worse than anything. I am quoting: "This worried me worse than anything."

Now, I want to ask you this: In 1940, when you were worried about this international situation, Germany and Russia were allies. How did you rationalize that fact in your interest in communism?

Mr. SINGER. Well, sir, that, to me, was an immateriality, since I knew and I felt very strongly that both Russia and Germany would be at war. Hitler had stated that repeatedly and the other maneuvers were, in my estimation, just to clear the way.

And I think that I was right as things occurred, but, as I saw it, that seemed like the brewing struggle and the rest did not seem material—

Mr. KUNZIG. So when many—

Mr. SINGER (continuing). And I didn't—

Well—

Mr. KUNZIG. So when many Communists left the group or lost their interests in communism due to Russia's alliance with Germany, you didn't leave; you stayed an interested Communist; is that right?

Mr. SINGER. Russia's alliance—

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you, Witness.

Mr. SINGER. Russia's alliance with Germany—

That was in 1939, wasn't it, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. And it lasted until 1941.

Mr. SINGER. Until they were at war?

Mr. KUNZIG. That's correct.

Mr. SINGER. And my joining this group was in 1940 or 1941, sir. It was approximately a year or a year and a half. I don't recollect the precise dates of the pact between the two countries, but certainly in my thinking, in the interim, time must have played an important role.

The thing which I think I stated yesterday, and which I felt was very important in my own mood and my own mind at the time, was the terrible depression I felt when France fell, which I think was about the middle of 1940.

Mr. KUNZIG. June 1940—June 17, I believe.

Mr. SINGER. June 1940.

And if you remember the news dispatches, and so on, the invincibility of the Germans—they had extraordinary gases that paralyzed the nerves—and that they walked over the fortifications, and so on, of France—the so-called invincible fortifications of France.

I am trying to recapture some of this mood, and it is difficult in retrospect.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Robert G. Davis?

Mr. SINGER. No; I'm fairly sure that I never met Robert G. Davis.

Mr. CLARDY. The question was not whether you met him, but whether you knew him at all.

Mr. SINGER. I've read about him, sir, but I'm sure I never knew him.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew about him, then?

Mr. SINGER. I knew about him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I've stated my reasons——

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you refusing——

Mr. SINGER (continuing). For declining.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment; is that correct?

Mr. SINGER. On the grounds of honor and conscience and the fifth amendment, which I stated before, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know, while you were at MIT, Wendell H. Furry?

Mr. SINGER. I was never at MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. I'm sorry. I meant to say at Harvard. While you were at Harvard, did you know Wendell H. Furry?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I knew Wendell H. Furry.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Wendell H. Furry as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I decline again, sir, on the grounds——

Mr. KUNZIG. On the same grounds?

Mr. SINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Did you know Isador Amdur—A-m-d-u-r?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Isador Amdur as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I give the same answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Norman Levinson?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I knew him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Norman Levinson as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I give the same answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ballis Edwin Blaisdell—B-l-a-i-s-d-e-l-l?

Mr. SINGER. I do not think, sir, I knew Mr. Blaisdell.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, did you know him?

Mr. SINGER. I don't think I know him. It's a question of a name and a face. If you had a picture, perhaps I could say—yes; I knew him—but, at most, if I did know him, or recognized him from a face, it would be a person that I knew perhaps very casually; but I think I never knew him.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, would you suspend just a minute?

We would like to confer with you.

(At this point the committee members conferred with Mr. Kunzig.)

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a John H. Reynolds?

Mr. SINGER. I knew, sir, John H. Reynolds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I answer the same way.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Dirk——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

You answer the same way?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. You decline to answer?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I think the record will show clearly that in all these answers he is declining to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Do I understand that?

Mr. SINGER. And honor and conscience, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you. I can't hear what you add to that each time.

Mr. SINGER. And honor and conscience.

Mr. CLARDY. Honor and conscience?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I feel extremely strong about it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Dirk Struik—S-t-r-u-i-k?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I knew him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Dirk Struik to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I decline again, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know William Ted Martin?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I knew him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I decline again, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Lawrence Arguimbau?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I decline again, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Israel Halperin—

Mr. SINGER. No; I never—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). H-a-l-p-e-r-i-n?

Mr. SINGER. I have heard of him, sir, but I do not know—

Mr. CLARDY. You knew of his record, I take it?

Mr. SINGER. I have read in the paper, sir, about—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I am talking about back as of the time we are discussing your acquaintance with these others. You knew of his activities and of his record as of that time, did you not?

Mr. SINGER. No; at that time I am sure, sir, I didn't.

Mr. CLARDY. You hadn't heard of him until the hearings going on here?

Mr. SINGER. I heard of him in—perhaps the middle of the forty's, at a later time. There was some incident.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Israel Halperin at any time to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I did not—I did not know him, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then, you didn't know him at any time to be a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know William T. Parry—P-a-r-r-y?

Mr. SINGER. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You never knew a William T. Parry?

Mr. SINGER. No; I've read about him in the paper recently, but I did not know him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Helen Deane Markham?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I know a Helen Deane Markham.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Helen Deane Markham to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I decline again, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know at any time a Dr. Philip Morrison—I believe at Cornell University?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. You did know Dr. Philip Morrison?

Mr. SINGER. I know him now.

Mr. KUNZIG. You do know him today?

Mr. SINGER. Yes. I met him when I came to Cornell.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINGER. I do not know him to be a member of the Communist Party. I do not know him to be.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, these people we have mentioned up to this time—Robert G. Davis, Wendell H. Furry, Isador Amdur, Norman Levinson, John H. Reynolds, Dirk Struik, William Ted Martin, Lawrence Arguimbau, and Helen Deane Markham—did they attend these meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I decline again on the grounds which I have already stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right. I am going to take them individually for the purpose of this record.

Did Robert G. Davis attend these meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. I said I did not know Robert Davis.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't know Robert Davis at all?

Mr. SINGER. No; I've read——

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Mr. SINGER (continuing). About Robert Davis.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Wendell H. Furry attend these Communist meetings you testified about yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I decline.

Mr. CLARDY. May I put it another way, Counsel: Did he attend any one of the meetings?

Mr. SINGER. I decline, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Isador Amdur attend any one of these meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Norman Levinson attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again, I decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did John H. Reynolds attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Dirk Struik attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again, I decline for the reasons I have said.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did William Ted Martin attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again I decline, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Lawrence Arguimbau attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Helen Deane Markham attend any one of these Communist meetings to which you testified yesterday?

Mr. SINGER. Again, sir, I decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. I request, sir, that the witness be directed to answer that series of questions, as they are completely pertinent and relevant to the matter before this committee.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Again I want to say to the witness that, under the obligations imposed upon us by the House of Representatives and the duty we have, it is very necessary that, if we are to carry out these duties, the witnesses we bring before this committee not only answer as to their own affiliation with the Communist Party or any other subversive group but also tell about the operations of that particular group, tell who were members, and so forth.

I know you are represented by able counsel, and I hope you will realize there is a possibility that you will be cited for contempt of this committee and contempt of Congress.

Bearing that in mind, the Chair feels that these questions put to you by counsel, which you declined to answer, are pertinent to this committee's work; and, therefore, I direct you to answer these questions.

Mr. SINGER. Sir—

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER (continuing). I am prepared to speak fully about myself, as I did yesterday, and tell you everything about myself, waiving my right to my own opinions, past or present, in honesty and sincerely; but I could never, sir, in honor and conscience, trade someone's career for my own, come what may, and I wish to restate my position: That, in honor and conscience, I just cannot, and also for fear of incrimination—

Mr. VELDE. Well, let me say—

Mr. SINGER (continuing). On advice of counsel, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Let me say, as far as trading your career or trading anybody else's career, to satisfy us, or answer the questions put to you, we are not interested in any way whatsoever in interfering with your occupation or that of any other witness who has come before this committee, or the right and privilege of having a job at a great university.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. We are only interested in obtaining facts relative to the operations of subversive activities in this country, and in particular relative to the operations of the Communist Party, past and present.

I think that you know—and this committee certainly does—that no witness who has come before this committee and answered questions truthfully has ever been incriminated by this committee; and, further than that, I know of no one who has suffered any loss of employment by reason of his cooperation or his testimony concerning subversive activities in this country.

Mr. SINGER. I appreciate very much the position of the committee and the rights of the committee to investigate, and it's a position which I honor, sir; and, for myself, I will state emphatically if ever I encounter subversion among anyone, irrespective of whether they are my colleagues, I will gladly report it. It's my duty, I feel, to report it; but we were not subversive, sir. We didn't follow any slavist policy. We were intellectuals. We were scholars. We were pur-

suing a right, as we thought it, and if we are disinterested at the moment, at the present time, it merely——

Mr. VELDE. The committee realizes—I am speaking for myself primarily, but I think the other members of the committee realize—you thought you at that time were not engaged in any subversive activities; but it so happens now this committee is attempting to determine the nature of those activities in order to determine whether or not they were subversive and have been subversive for a long time——

Mr. SINGER. I appreciate——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And it is for that reason we are asking you these questions.

Mr. SINGER. I appreciate that, very well, sir, and I have spoken about my feelings. I have tried to project myself back into a world which was different than it is now. I have completely disassociated myself from those activities, and I have expressed that. I have no interest in those activities at all, but as I look back on them I give you my honest evaluation.

I do not feel remorse of those things. Perhaps it was a stage in my own development. Perhaps it was a certain need. Perhaps it was a question of inquisitiveness, in part.

Mr. VELDE. That is just exactly what this committee is trying to find out, Dr. Singer——

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And if you would answer these questions, it would help us a lot in determining how the Communist Party operated and how they were able to infiltrate almost every phase of our American life.

Mr. SINGER. I describe that according to my feelings, and I am prepared to continue, sir, even on opinions, on various things; but I just feel——

Mr. VELDE. We are not too much interested in opinions. We are interested in facts.

Mr. SINGER. I feel, sir——

Mr. VELDE. The questions asked you——

Mr. SINGER. I feel——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). By Counsel are questions of fact.

Mr. SINGER. Well, sir, I just feel I could not possibly work in my laboratory again. It's not that I'm hiding something. It's—it's like the end of a rope, in many ways. It's a basic feeling, sir, and I just cannot——

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest——

Mr. SINGER (continuing). Change my position.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Since you have directed the witness to answer the questions it would probably be well, in view of that direction, if Counsel would again ask him either singly or collectively as to whether or not those members attended any single meeting. In other words, I think they should be repeated now that the direction of the Chair has been given so this record may be clear.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I think the record is clear enough with reference to his refusal to answer relative to those people he knew.

Mr. CLARDY. Maybe we could get at it this way: Witness, do I understand your refusal to answer to be that you would refuse to respond to any question dealing with the identification of any of these who

have been named as members of the group or meetings that you attended?

You are just making a blanket denial and refusal to answer any questions along that line?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; on the grounds which I have stated, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I understand what you have stated, but your refusal is a blanket refusal?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that will shorten it up a little bit.

I think you are ill-advised, especially in view of what happened at the Rumanian Embassy yesterday, sir, and I think you should reconsider your position and assist this committee in exposing to the light of day every bit of information that you have.

That is all I have, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. WALTER. Well, may I remind the witness of this: We are not interested in the names of the people as such. We are interested in learning about the ramifications of this conspiracy so that we might be in a position to recommend to the Congress of the United States remedial legislation.

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. The fact that names enter into this is purely incidental.

Mr. SINGER. Well, sir, that's in part a feeling of mine, and I answered along those lines, sir, and I am prepared to go on—

Mr. WALTER. No, but you—

Mr. SINGER. About myself, sir.

Mr. WALTER (continuing). You see, in light of what I say, what you are actually doing is impeding this committee in its attempts to devise the kind of legislation that will afford some degree of security and protection to the United States.

We don't care who these people were as individuals. We want to know what they did, and where they are now.

Mr. DOYLE. May I add this suggestion—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In view of that very appropriate observation by Mr. Walter: Under Public Law 601 we are assigned to make a study of the extent—of the extent—of subversive activities.

Now, calling that language to your attention, I feel it would make it clear to you as a distinguished educator that that is one additional reason why we are anxious to find, and we are duty-bound to find under the law, the number of people in these groups and how they functioned, what they did, as members of the Communist Party, or as Communists who were not members of the Communist Party; and I am sure we are all trying to make that perfectly clear to you—

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Not to have you do something which your conscience wouldn't in honor allow you to do, but to try to get your help, sir—

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I would like—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In our study.

Mr. SINGER. I would like to tell you about myself, my impressions, my understanding, as I did yesterday, and continue on that line, sir; but I just—

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask just this one more question, Mr. Chairman, because I wasn't here yesterday in committee meeting and didn't have

the benefit of hearing the testimony yesterday: Do I understand the situation correctly that you, on yesterday, and again today, state frankly that you are a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. Were.

Mr. DOYLE. That you were a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. But you didn't state yesterday or today whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party. Is there a difference in your position?

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle, may I suggest something before the witness answers?

Mr. VELDE. Not——

Mr. CLARDY. The record is pretty clear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

(At this point the committee members and Mr. Kunzig conferred.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this line of questioning which I started was gone through yesterday. The House was in session; I was there.

Mr. CLARDY. I could have told you that a long time ago.

Mr. DOYLE. The House of Representatives meets at 11 o'clock this morning instead of 12. So, I will withdraw my question.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I continue, sir?

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Dr. Singer, you testified yesterday at these meetings there were only 7 or 8 people, maximum, and in the total group over a period of meetings there weren't more than about 14 or 15 people.

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I hazard——

Mr. KUNZIG. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. SINGER (continuing). A guess, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is relatively correct?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Therefore, it would not be difficult for you, with such a small number of people, to recollect their names if you wanted to give them here today; would it?

Mr. SINGER. Well, I think in part, yes; it would, because people, like myself, came and went. Those were the war years. Scientists—they'd come as instructors, something of that sort, then leave the university and go to another place——

Mr. KUNZIG. But the sum total of names——

Mr. SINGER (continuing). And we didn't worry about those, except those we knew.

Mr. KUNZIG. But the sum total of names never exceeded more than than 14 or 15 people that were in this Communist group; is that correct?

Mr. SINGER. I do not think so.

Mr. KUNZIG. You do not think it exceeded more than 14 or 15?

Mr. SINGER. I hazard a guess on it. That is my impression——

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask you a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SINGER (continuing). As I look back on it.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. When we adjourned yesterday—as you know, I went into this in considerable length—you had had the suggestion put to you that the committee did want you to tell us whether any of these

people had attended the meeting. Now, during the interval since we adjourned yesterday morning and this morning have you checked up on any information in writing or otherwise that you may have to refresh your recollection as to whether these people did or did not attend meetings?

Mr. SINGER. I checked up in the interim on my feeling, basic feeling, sir, about the questions that you asked me; and that's what I think I devoted most of my time. The rest of the time I tried to rest.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, there isn't any doubt about the fact if you were willing to answer you could tell us, clearly and distinctly, whether any one or all of these people attended any of the meetings? That is a fact as of this time, isn't it?

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were these other people who attended these meetings professors or on the teaching staff of either Harvard or MIT?

Mr. SINGER. As I recollect, these people, sir, they were professionals, like myself, associated with the universities.

Mr. KUNZIG. In the teaching capacity?

Mr. SINGER. In some capacity with the university.

Mr. KUNZIG. Harvard and MIT?

Mr. SINGER. Harvard and MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, in addition to the names that I have already asked you about this morning, were there any other names of any other people whom you recollect who attended these Communist meetings with you?

Mr. SINGER. I decline, sir, on the grounds—

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever work on a Government project?

Mr. SINGER. Well, I was at the medical school and employed by the medical school.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year was that?

Mr. SINGER. That was—I was at the medical school for a long period.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. As I pointed out to you, from '42 until '51, and during the war years I worked part time in my research on a project on blood, on blood plasma, and the fractionation of blood plasma at Harvard Medical School, and as I understand it part of my salary, approximately half, was paid by way of that project, and I was—

Mr. KUNZIG. From the Federal Government?

Mr. SINGER. Office of Scientific Research and Development—

Mr. KUNZIG. Paid—

Mr. SINGER (continuing). From which I received a citation for my work. So, I presume the pay came from that—either that or other funds which supported the department. I didn't go into that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Government funds?

Mr. SINGER. Either Government funds or perhaps Rockefeller funds supported that blood-plasma project.

I had a specific job to perform.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you know whether that job was classified or unclassified?

Mr. SINGER. That project was classified, and some of the research which I did in relation to it was released during the time of the war, and indeed, I published it, with permission, in a paper which came out in 1945 in the Journal of Neurosurgery.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Dr. Singer, since this is during the war years, going back to your testimony yesterday, that meant you worked on this classified project at a time when you considered yourself a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. Yes, sir.

Through this period there were very loose associations during the war, but—

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever asked by the college as to whether you were a Communist—

Mr. SINGER. No.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Prior to working on this classified work?

Mr. SINGER. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever asked by any Federal authorities or investigators as to whether you were a Communist—

Mr. SINGER. No.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Prior to working on this classified work?

Mr. SINGER. No; I have no recollection of that. I feel fairly certain not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know whether you were ever cleared to work for classified work?

Mr. SINGER. I must have been cleared to work for classified work. I presume that's the nature of the classified work.

Mr. KUNZIG. But nobody ever asked you any questions?

Mr. SINGER. The only thing I remember in connection with that was a form whose character I don't recollect that I signed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you state on that form that you signed that you were a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. No; I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall whether you were asked whether you were a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. I do not think I was asked that at any time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you required to take any oath as to whether you were a Communist?

Mr. SINGER. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Singer, will you tell this committee briefly your viewpoint on whether a Communist today is qualified to teach school or in the colleges of this Nation—

Mr. SINGER. From my—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). From your experience?

Mr. SINGER. Based on—

Mr. KUNZIG. Your own personal experience.

Mr. SINGER. And my associations?

Mr. KUNZIG. Your associations with Communists.

Mr. SINGER. I feel honestly—I think anyone who is—irrespective of his political opinions, if he is a good teacher and a good scholar and performs his duty, should be permitted to teach.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean an active Communist today should be permitted to teach today?

Mr. SINGER. I feel that if he is a good teacher and a good scholar and doesn't use his lecture platform to further his political views—that is the only way I could judge him, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Despite the fact that the Communists have no freedom, no academic freedom, in their thinking, you still would say that?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I'm going back into my feelings.

Mr. CLARDY. No, not going back into your experience——

Mr. SINGER. Well, I am looking at myself——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Since we know today——

Mr. SINGER (continuing). Because that's the only person really that I know best, is myself, and I cannot see a disparity in that reasoning.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you not recognize the fact that today any active member of the Communist Party does not have freedom of thought?

Mr. SINGER. I understand that, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. Assuming that is the fact and forgetting your own past experience——

Mr. SINGER. If a person——

Mr. CLARDY. Excuse me just a minute.

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you not agree, based on that, that a Communist is not worthy to teach our youth today?

Mr. SINGER. You see, those I knew I feel were not unworthy to teach; but if they slavishly followed a policy, if they are bound in discipline, rigidly, to a policy and devote their lives to a policy, they could not possibly be a good teacher.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, if he is an active Communist—and I use the word "active"—then he would be bound to the party line and should be disqualified, should he not?

Mr. SINGER. If he undertakes this slavishness. I do not, myself, believe that the mass of Communists today even would follow this. This is not speaking about the leaders, but I think if people sort of take a peek and look around, and if disinterested, disabused, what have you, leaving——

Mr. CLARDY. You would trust a Communist, then, to teach our youth today and trust to chance that he wouldn't slavishly follow the Communist Party line? Is that your attitude?

Mr. SINGER. I would trust a person who performs his duties, his jobs, in adequate fashion. If he is going to teach, for example, like I do, anatomy, and he does a good job and teaches anatomy, accurately, if he doesn't use his lecture podium as a platform for his political views, if he doesn't try, after school, to impose his philosophy in any shape or manner on his colleagues, or on his students, I do not see why—why not—why he shouldn't teach.

Mr. CLARDY. You would risk that, then?

Mr. SINGER. I think our country can risk that, because I feel that the basic freedoms in our country have protected really our country, and I think when things are more—the more hope and freedom is allowed for this, that we have nothing really to fear. It's no major movement, and never has gotten roots in our country, and I think it never will obtain roots in our country as long as our country is the greatest country as it has been, and strong and a free country.

Mr. KUNZIG. But it got you for a period of 5 years; is that correct?

Mr. SINGER. It got me for a period longer, but not——

Mr. KUNZIG. How long?

Mr. SINGER (continuing). In thesen se that you say it got me, sir. I never followed anything slavishly. I considered myself a Marxian,

studied this philosophy. I was interested in it. I supported it. I identified myself with it, as I spoke to you freely yesterday.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you were interested, as you also testified, in making it work practically, in addition to just studying?

Mr. SINGER. In what way, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, you testified it wasn't just studying, but it was practical——

Mr. SINGER. Try to apply it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. Try to apply a philosophy. When you take a system of philosophy, you try to see how does it work in relation to things. You reject things. Certain other things intrigue you at the moment. At a later time they do not intrigue you. Some of these things pass you by and you forget about them. You may be disinterested.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you know today the Communist Party is an organization, a conspiracy, to overthrow this Government, don't you?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I know——

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know that today?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I know about the Smith Act, and——

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, at the time that you were connected with this group you testified yesterday that you paid money to support this group, did you not?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. You contributed?

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. I contributed money. I don't remember paying the dues as such.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you contributed money?

Mr. SINGER. I contributed money.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. I contributed money. I contributed on the basis of drives, sir, for example, to support the Worker, which was always in——

Mr. KUNZIG. The Daily Worker, you mean?

Mr. SINGER. The Daily Worker——

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. Or the Sunday Worker, which was chronically in arrears. I supported that, feeling strongly toward supporting it, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. And this was in a period in which the Smith Act was in effect, isn't that correct?

Mr. SINGER. Well——

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, it was.

Mr. SINGER. I mean——

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know the Smith Act was in effect?

Mr. SINGER. When was the Smith Act——

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. KUNZIG. 1940.

Mr. SINGER. 1940.

What I knew, sir, is that we were going in the same direction, and we were all in the same war together, and that's why my interest fell at that——

Mr. KUNZIG. We weren't in the same war in 1940 when you began in connection with this Communist group. At that time Russia was allied with Germany, whom we were almost ready to fight.

Mr. SINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did that matter to you at that time?

Mr. SINGER. I told you about my feelings that I was sure—I was certain—here in the United States we were arming for that eventual-ity; we were afraid of attack by Germany ourselves.

Mr. KUNZIG. What about Russia's attack on Finland, which occurred about that same period of time? Did that concern you?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; that concerned me.

Mr. KUNZIG. That did?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you still remained a member of the Communist group and stayed active?

Mr. SINGER. Could you tell me the dates on that, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe it was just prior to your time of joining the group, but you joined the group and stayed a member of it in spite of the Finnish war.

Mr. SINGER. I felt then—I haven't thought about these things for years—I must have felt, in trying to analyze my feelings about this, in many of these situations, it's the major powers that determine the whole world situation and the small powers are sort of swamped out; but I don't recollect clearly on that, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Now, you say, Dr. Singer, that you contributed to the Communist Party and its various organizations, such as the New York Daily Worker. Could you tell us how much you contributed?

Mr. SINGER. Well, sir, I could not contribute very much because, first of all, I was a student at the time, and then I was a young instructor. My salary was extremely low, and whatever I may have contributed might have been in—a 50 cents or a dollar, or something of that sort. It couldn't possibly have been anything more.

Mr. VELDE. Well, could you give us any estimate of the amount that you contributed to what you considered to be Communist causes?

Mr. SINGER. Well, you mean a total estimate?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. I couldn't possibly.

How could one do it?

It doesn't matter. After all, the limitation was my salary, and the drives for these things were irksome in that sense, and I just couldn't possibly have contributed very much—but a dollar here, or 50 cents there, on occasion.

Mr. VELDE. Well, would you say it would be as much as \$100?

Mr. SINGER. Perhaps over the years.

Mr. CLARDY. You contributed as much as you could, considering the nature of your financial status, I take it?

Mr. SINGER. Yes; and my interest.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to ask a question.

Doctor, in response to a question by counsel, "Do you know communism is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States?" you said, "I know about the Smith Act."

Am I to understand from that that you believe this is a conspiracy only because the Congress of the United States had said that it is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government?

Mr. SINGER. Look, sir, I'm certainly not a legal expert and I haven't—

Mr. WALTER. Don't you know that as a fact?

Mr. SINGER. Just what I read, you see, is my understanding. It's been judged as such. I've disassociated myself from it completely for these reasons and for the reasons which I stated yesterday.

Mr. WALTER. But I am not interested in that at all.

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. I want to know whether, as a fact, you believe that communism is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government.

Mr. SINGER. That's what they've jailed the leaders on; yes.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you agree that is what it is?

Mr. SINGER. That in the long-range viewpoint, yes; but I, in myself, projecting myself back, and my feelings, we did not conspire. We did not do anything subversive, or anything of that sort. Maybe people would call us foolish for even reading the literature on the thing, but I can't even feel remorse on that level in looking back. It was—

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I understand that, but what I am interested in is the present, not your immature conclusions as a student. Do you believe that now communism is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government?

Mr. SINGER. I don't know.

Mr. CLARDY. What is your answer?

Mr. SINGER. I accept that, sir.

Mr. WALTER. And not because of the Smith Act, but you believe as a matter of fact it is a conspiracy?

Mr. SINGER. It is this great international situation which—

Mr. VELDE. Are you through?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Well, in view of that, wouldn't your conscience allow you, in view of the last statement you made, admitting your feeling that the Communist Party was a conspiracy to overthrow this form of government, to answer the questions put to you by counsel and members of this committee?

Mr. SINGER. Sir—

Mr. VELDE. In order that we might find some effective way of combating and fighting this conspiracy—

Mr. SINGER. I'm telling you—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Wouldn't your conscience permit you to answer the questions?

Mr. SINGER. I'm telling you of my feelings. My conscience demands that anyone I know of who is subversive or has been subversive should be reported, and I state that frankly. That's my full feeling. There is no reservation on it.

But this was not subversion. I participated in this, sir. I analyzed it. It just wasn't. It wasn't a conspiracy. We didn't follow slavishly this type of doctrine. We were interested. Perhaps you could call it a scholarly interest or not on this. It was an attraction. Perhaps it was a need on our part.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Witness, I agree with you, as I have said before, that you probably felt that way; but I am satisfied, too, that the Government of the United States has, through its courts and through its committees of Congress—

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And through its legislative bodies, has determined that it has been a conspiracy in the past.

Now, in view of that determination by your own Government—

Mr. SINGER. My feelings—

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Will you not answer the questions so that we might be able to ascertain facts, more facts, about this conspiracy in order that we might recommend—

Mr. SINGER. In my feelings—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Legislation to combat it?

Mr. SINGER. In my feelings, sir, my feelings have paralled the Government's. I have disassociated myself completely from this. I do not associate myself with the concepts of this at all. The nature of the times has demanded that from me, and I have responded to that—

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Witness—

Mr. SINGER (continuing). But I cannot change.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). I realize you don't think at the present time it has been a conspiracy—

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). But in view of the fact your own Government has determined it to be not only a conspiracy at the present time, but it has been a conspiracy for a good long while, don't you feel you owe it to your Government to tell us about the things you were engaged in—

Mr. SINGER. I am.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And the people engaged in it with you?

Mr. SINGER. I am telling you about the things I was engaged in—was engaged in, sir—and my opinions and views on it, and I am telling you there was no subversion. It was not. Otherwise, I would—

Mr. VELDE. Was Wendell H. Furry engaged in those activities with you?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I have already answered.

Mr. VELDE. No.

Mr. CLARDY. You've declined to answer.

Mr. VELDE. No; you declined to answer.

Mr. SINGER. Yes; I declined to answer.

Mr. VELDE. Let's get this straight.

Mr. SINGER. I mean I am repeating my—

Mr. VELDE. I want to ask you again: Was Wendell Furry engaged in these activities that you have told us about along with you?

Mr. SINGER. Sir, I decline to answer that on the grounds which I've stated.

Mr. CLARDY. May I make a statement?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I can't let you leave the stand without telling you this, as one individual member: You have placed your judgment above that of your Government and your Congress in deciding yourself whether or not the Communist movement is a conspiracy and

all those who take any part in it are engaged in that conspiracy; and, so, I must tell you, as one Member, that I think you are in contempt of your Congress and of this committee, and I shall do what I can within my power to see that you are cited for that contempt.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter.

(At this point Mr. Singer conferred with Mr. Pollitt.)

Mr. SINGER. We were autonomous.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't ask you a question, sir.

Mr. SINGER. We were——

Mr. CLARDY. I made a statement so you would be apprised of my attitude toward you as a result of your attitude toward the Congress.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a couple of questions?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Because I was busy on other official matters yesterday, I wasn't here to hear your testimony and perhaps this question was asked and answered yesterday: When did you stop meeting with this group, or about when did you stop meeting with the group, with which you identified yourself?

Mr. SINGER. Attending meetings of this sort, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. SINGER. Well, as I explained yesterday, from—during the post-war years my interests dwindled in this group for the reasons I stated.

Mr. DOYLE. May I interrupt?

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't repeat the explanation of yesterday.

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Just say about what year did you stop meeting.

Mr. SINGER. I do not think I attended, in my recollection, any meetings of this nature after 1948 or 1949.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I will not ask you at this time at all for the names of the people that met with you, because you have been asked that several times in several ways, but when did the group stop meeting, if you know, if they ever did?

Mr. SINGER. Well, I do not—I do not know.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, approximately.

Mr. SINGER. Sir, if they ever did—you see, I disassociated myself from these meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. SINGER. I wasn't——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Weren't you there?

Mr. SINGER. I wasn't bound to attend these meetings. I wasn't under any discipline.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many were in the group to which you refer as having been members when you stopped meeting with it?

Mr. SINGER. Well——

Mr. DOYLE. About how many?

Mr. SINGER. I don't—I don't think, sir, there were many in that group—perhaps 4 or 5, or——

Mr. DOYLE. And were there ever more than 4 or 5 in it during the time you met with it?

Mr. SINGER. Well, I answered that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, just——

Mr. SINGER. I answered that.

Mr. DOYLE. Just——

Mr. SINGER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many more?

Mr. SINGER. There were more, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many more?

Mr. SINGER. I would say perhaps, on the average, 6 or 7 or 8 at one time.

Mr. DOYLE. And about how many different persons, to your knowledge, in connection with the teaching or employment of the university were in it? About how many different persons, to your personal knowledge?

Mr. SINGER. I hazard a guess on that, sir, which I repeated before, that I would think about 13 or so.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be continued under subpoena further, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. I don't know of any reason, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess until further call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 11:11 a. m., the hearing was recessed, subject to call of the chairman.)

# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

## (Education—Part 5)

---

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION <sup>1</sup>

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 1501, House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon Scherer, Francis Walter, and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; Raphael I. Nixon; director of research; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; and Dolores Anderson, reporter.

Mr. VELDE. The meeting will come to order. Let the record show that present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, and myself, Mr. Velde, chairman, being a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. Counsel, do you have a witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Professor Gelbart. Will you stand to be sworn, please?

Mr. VELDE. Do you solemnly swear in the testimony you are about to give, to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. GELBART. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ABE GELBART, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,  
PAUL SHIPMAN ANDREWS

Mr. KUNZIG. I see you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. ANDREWS. My name is Paul Shipman Andrews, executive director of the Syracuse College of Law. Do you want anything further about me?

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address at the present time in the practice of law?

Mr. ANDREWS. I have just finished a job as counselor in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and have not yet opened an office, but am going in partnership in Syracuse, N. Y. My home address, at

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee on June 15, 1953, in view of the controversy over identification of the witness as a member or former member of the Communist Party.

which for a long while I will be, is Wolff Hollow, Onondaga Hill Post Office, via Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. Since you have not before appeared before this committee, for a brief time I should like to inform you that you may at anytime confer with your client at this hearing, which is an executive session, as you see, but it is a traditional ruling of this committee that you may not speak publicly, or make any address before this committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. You do understand this?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you advise him further that if he has any written motion he will be able to present it?

Mr. ANDREWS. May I ask what you mean by motion?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes sir, a statement which you would like to present.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Gelbart, will you state your full name and address?

Dr. GELBART. As I commonly call myself?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Dr. GELBART. Abe Gelbart, 108 Carlton Drive, Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, sir?

Dr. GELBART. I was born at Paterson, N. J., December 2, 1911.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, please?

Dr. GELBART. I went to the Paterson Grade School and High School. In 1935 I went to Dalhousie as a freshman and got my bachelor's degree in 1938.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is in Nova Scotia?

Dr. GELBART. Yes, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does that complete your educational background?

Dr. GELBART. No; I went in 1938 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and received my doctorate there.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you give the committee a résumé of your employment background, please?

Dr. GELBART. From MIT I went to North Carolina State School of Engineering, in Raleigh, N. C. That was from 1940 to 1942. The summer of 1941 I was research assistant at Brown University and there the war program was applying mathematics and theoretical mechanics. The summer of 1942 I was appointed as associate researcher. In December of 1942 I took a position with the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics. I remained there until July 1, 1943, when I became assistant professor at Syracuse University. I have been there since then.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present status at the Syracuse University?

Dr. GELBART. Associate professor of mathematics.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you were at Syracuse, did you know one Ted Martin?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he head of your department there at that time?

Dr. GELBART. He was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did he bring you to Syracuse University?

Dr. GELBART. It was his letter of appointment that brought me there. Or it was, rather, his letter of invitation that resulted in my appointment at Syracuse.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is the same Ted Martin who testified before this committee a few weeks ago?

Dr. GELBART. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. And who is now head of the mathematics department at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. William Ted Martin?

Dr. GELBART. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. In this period from 1938 to 1940, when you were at MIT, as you have just testified, did you know a Wendell H. Furry while you were at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. I knew the name. I believe I may have met him.

Mr. KUNZIG. How many times did you meet him, if you know?

Dr. GELBART. I am not certain. I do not remember his face at this moment. I have no recollection of his face.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Robert G. Davis?

Dr. GELBART. To the best of my knowledge I have never met the gentleman.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know an Isadore Amdur?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew Isadore Amdur?

Mr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Norman Levinson?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you still know Norman Levinson at this time?

Dr. GELBART. Yes; I still know him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ballis Edwin Blaisdell?

Dr. GELBART. I know the name, and have probably met him. I have no recollection of it, and don't believe I would remember his face at this time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know John H. Reynolds?

Dr. GELBART. To the very best of my knowledge, I never met that gentleman.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Dirk Struik?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know William Ted Martin at that time—1938 to 1940, when you were at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Lawrence Arguimbau?

Dr. GELBART. I answer very sincerely—I do not believe that I ever met him. I certainly have no recollection of meeting him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Israel Halperin?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know William T. Parry?

Dr. GELBART. To the best of my recollection, I never heard the name until I read it in the newspaper recently, and certainly never saw the man.

Mr. VELDE. Is that also true of Reynolds?

Dr. GELBART. The first I read his name was when I read about him in the newspaper. No; I believe I read it first in the testimony. I never heard his name before.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Professor Gelbart, while you were at MIT from 1938 to 1940, did you attend any meetings of a Marxist study group at the home of either Martin, Amdur, or any of that group I have mentioned here?

Dr. GELBART. I very sincerely say that to the best of my recollection, and I have thought about it for some time, that I attended no such meetings.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever attend any meetings of a Communist Party group in the homes of any of those gentlemen whose names I have just mentioned?

Dr. GELBART. To the very best of my recollection, I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever attend any Communist Party meetings at any place during that period of time from 1938 to 1940 when you were at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. I remember only one. That was at a big public meeting. I don't recall the date at all. It was held in the Boston Arena and there must have been some 15,000 people present—12,000 or 10,000, I don't know for sure how many.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was it a Communist Party meeting?

Dr. GELBART. I don't know. I only know there were Communist Party speakers. Earl Browder spoke at that time.

Excuse me one moment please, may I speak to my counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; you may speak at any time with your counsel. (At this point witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. May I speak off the record one moment, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Yes. It is off the record, Miss Reporter.

(Witness speaks to committee off the record for a time.)

Mr. VELDE. We will go on the record, Miss Reporter.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Gelbart, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you at any time ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. May I have the privilege of making a very short explanatory statement?

Mr. VELDE. Well, if you will answer the question first. The committee has always allowed the witness who has answered the question to make a statement explaining his answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Answering means "Yes" or "No." and not the fifth amendment. That is taken to be not an answer.

Dr. GELBART. I would like the committee's indulgence in my asking for the privilege of the fifth amendment not to answer the question.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are then refusing to answer and presenting the fifth amendment as your reason to refuse?

Dr. GELBART. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have said that because you said you are asking the committee's indulgence. That isn't necessary. You have the right to ask it if you so desire.

Dr. GELBART. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have stated that you knew Wendell H. Furry during the time you were at MIT. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point the witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. May I again ask that I have the privilege of making a short statement?

Mr. VELDE. If you will answer the question first, please.

Dr. GELBART. I would wish not to answer that question for the same reason I have stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then you decline for the same reason, the fifth amendment?

Dr. GELBART. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Wendell H. Furry as one of the group of professors who attended Communist meetings?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reasons stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend any meetings with Wendell H. Furry of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reasons stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have stated you knew Isadore Amdur. Did you know Isadore Amdur to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Isadore Amdur attend meetings of the Communist Party with you?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reason I have stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. You stated that you knew Norman Levinson. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Norman Levinson attend Communist Party meetings or any meetings of the Communist group with you?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Dirk Struik, whom you have already stated you knew, ever attend Communist Party meetings, or meetings of the Communist group?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know William Ted Martin to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did William Ted Martin attend meetings of the Communist Party, or a meeting of Communist group?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Lawrence Arguimbau to be a member of the Communist Party? You have stated that you knew the name of Lawrence Arguimbau.

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason stated previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have already stated you just knew him by name, so I won't question you further as to whether you attended meetings of the Communist Party with him.

Did you know Israel Halperin to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason given previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Israel Halperin attend meetings of the Communist Party or a Communist group with you?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason given previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Helen Deane Markham?

Dr. GELBART. I never heard the name until I read about it recently.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you, Professor Gelbart, ever used any other name other than your own—any alias?

Dr. GELBART. Never, to my knowledge.

(At this point the witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. May I correct that? I believe my birth certificate had Abraham instead of Abe. And I believe on my MIT diploma the name Markham appears as my middle name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Those were the only variations from the name which you gave us at the beginning of your testimony?

Dr. GELBART. To the best of my recollection; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever travel abroad?

Dr. GELBART. Yes; twice.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you tell us, taking them in turn, why you went abroad?

Dr. GELBART. I was invited to go to the Hydro-Fluid Dynamic Institute at Sorbonne in Paris.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

Dr. GELBART. In the summer of 1949.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you traveling on a regular passport at that time?

Dr. GELBART. I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long did you remain in Europe?

Dr. GELBART. I was there 5 to 6 weeks.

Mr. KUNZIG. What countries did you visit?

Dr. GELBART. I visited England, France, and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you have any difficulty getting into Czechoslovakia in 1949?

Dr. GELBART. I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. You had a regular visa for Czechoslovakia and an American State Department permit?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the occasion of the other trip you took to Europe?

Dr. GELBART. I was the Fulbright lecturer to Norway.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

Dr. GELBART. The academic year 1951 to 1952.

(At this point the testimony taken was off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. The testimony goes back on the record now.

How long did you stay in Norway?

Dr. GELBART. I was in Norway approximately 9 months.

Mr. KUNZIG. What other countries did you visit in 1951 and 1952? During your European trip?

Dr. GELBART. Sweden, Denmark, and France.

Mr. KUNZIG. Turning back to Czechoslovakia, can you give the committee any further information on your reasons for the trip to Czechoslovakia, and for what purpose you made the trip?

Dr. GELBART. A colleague of mine in America in 1949 was a native Czechoslovakian and had been a professor of mathematics at the University of Czechoslovakia until about 1939, when he came to this country. He has since become a citizen of this country, and was a colleague of mine during 1949. He had an ailing brother in Czechoslovakia that he wanted me to visit that summer. He was a close friend of mine and we had agreed, since we would both be in Europe, that I might go over to Czechoslovakia and sight-see in Prague and he would show me around. I believe Prague was the only place I was in while in Czechoslovakia. I flew there and back and went through no other territory. The 4 days I was there was the only time I spent there. It was approximately 4 days—anywhere from 3 to 5 days that I sight-saw and visited with him. The one and only person I met in Czechoslovakia was a physicist by the name of Goldschmidt. Mr. Goldschmidt was a former colleague of my friend and he invited both of us to his home for dinner. During the entire course of the evening, Mr. Goldschmidt asked us to do everything we could to bring him to this country because he was anti-Communist, and was afraid for his life there. When we returned, we mentioned his name to several persons, several physicists around the country and asked if they could perhaps do something for him. For one reason or another, nothing was done. Many months ago I learned he had committed suicide. He and his wife were the only people I met in Czechoslovakia, other than the streetcar conductors, and such tradespeople, etc., that one normally would meet.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the name of the other friend?

Dr. GELBART. I would gladly give the name if I might do so in private.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. The committee cannot allow you to do that.

Dr. GELBART. I am just asking if I can do that. I don't understand the reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. This is as private as you can be.

Dr. GELBART. The man is a good man and has made many contributions to this country. He is Professor Loewner, at Stanford University.

Mr. CLARDY. What is his first name?

Dr. GELBART. Charles.

Mr. VELDE. May I make a statement for the record, to the effect that the fact that Dr. Loewner's name is mentioned in this testimony today is no reason why anyone should draw the inference he is subversive or in any way considered to be unpatriotic or disloyal.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a bit more? How long has he been in this country, and what position does he hold at Stanford University?

Dr. GELBART. He is a full professor there, and is director of research. He is a wonderful and famous mathematician.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is he now an American citizen?

Dr. GELBART. Yes; I believe he became an American citizen a few years ago.

Mr. WALTER. When did he leave Czechoslovakia?

Dr. GELBART. In 1939. He is of Jewish faith.

Mr. WALTER. What?

Dr. GELBART. He is of Jewish faith, which might account for his wanderings.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, you have mentioned names at MIT. May I ask if there are any other people whose names have not been mentioned here this morning with whom you attended Communist Party meetings or group meetings?

Dr. GELBART. I will decline to answer that for the reasons I gave before.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, whom we mentioned here this morning, testified before us a few weeks ago that there was a cell of the Communist Party at MIT, composed of certain professors and students, and instructors. He mentioned that one of the members of this MIT group was a Dr. Abe Gelbart. Are you the Dr. Gelbart mentioned by Professor Martin?

Dr. GELBART. I have every reason to believe that I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the Communist Party group at MIT, testified to by Dr. Martin?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is the same Dr. Martin, is it not, who was instrumental in obtaining your employment in 1933 at Syracuse?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you were, and are, a close friend of Dr. Martin; is that correct?

Dr. GELBART. I have been until now. I will continue to be.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now you mentioned you knew Dr. Levinson. Dr. Levinson testified here a few weeks ago before this committee and spoke of the same MIT group in which he admitted membership—he testified to the effect that he knew a Dr. Gelbart as a member of the group. Do you have any comment to make as to Mr. Levinson's testimony?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the same reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the Communist MIT group?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let me read the testimony of Dr. Levinson, given before this committee:

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other member of that group that you recall as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Let's see—Gelbart, that was mentioned here yesterday. I remember him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any knowledge whether Gelbart is still a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. In 1946 or 1947—I believe it was 1946—I can't be quite sure of that—Mr. Gelbart told me that he had left the Communist Party.

Now, Professor, did you make that statement to Dr. Levinson?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that question for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. The third witness before this committee, Isadore Amdur, whom you have already testified you knew, when asked about this same MIT group and who were members of that group, testified:

There was a Mr. Gelbardt. I can't spell that last name. I think it was probably G-e-l-b-a-r-d-t.

Do you have any comment to make about Mr. Amdur's testimony?

Dr. GELBART. First that the name is misspelled, and second, that I must decline to answer.

Mr. VELDE. Is Dr. Amdur's statement concerning you correct, true or false?

(At this point witness confers with counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you invited by any particular person to attend these meetings to which we have been referring?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given. (The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. I have been at Professor Martin's house many many times.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you at Professor Martin's house when these meetings of the Communist Party cell at MIT took place?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Professor Martin invite you to attend these meetings?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Levinson invite you to attend these meetings?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Amdur invite you to attend these meetings?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I would like to turn to something different for a moment. Were you ever employed at Langley Field?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

Dr. GELBART. I believe I stated before I was employed by the National Advisory Committee at Langley Field, between the months of—

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your recollection, of course.

Dr. GELBART (continuing). For about 6 or 7 or 8 months, in the overlapping years of 1942 and 1943.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now what again was the exact group with which you were working? What was the full name of the group?

Dr. GELBART. I was working in the compressionability section of the high-speed group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did this come under the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics?

Dr. GELBART. Yes, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you employed for a brief period of this time by the United States Government?

Dr. GELBART. I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were paid by the United States Government?

Dr. GELBART. I was paid by the United States Government; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. This was when the United States was at war. Now, Dr. Gelbart, did you ever handle any restricted or classified information while working at the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics at Langley Field?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever cleared to handle that type of material, as far as you know?

Dr. GELBART. I don't know.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever checked prior to your employment as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't remember being checked?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember being checked.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you asked to fill out forms as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I believe so, but I am not sure.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was this position which you held under civil service?

Dr. GELBART. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you fill out an application for this position?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember now, but to the best of my recollection I received a wire from them, asking me to become a member of their staff.

Mr. KUNZIG. The initial action in the entire matter was taken by them, not by you?

Dr. GELBART. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall filling out a civil-service questionnaire before becoming employed by the Federal Government?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember that.

Mr. WALTER. By "them" who do you mean?

Dr. GELBART. By the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

Mr. WALTER. Did you have any idea as to who "them" was?

Dr. GELBART. I might check it in my files, but I suspect it might have come out of the Washington office.

Mr. WALTER. Anyone you knew?

Dr. GELBART. I just don't recall who sent it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall filling out, or answering a question as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember if I answered such a question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall taking the loyalty oath or filling out a loyalty form?

Dr. GELBART. I don't remember it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just what type of work was it you were doing at Langley Field?

Dr. GELBART. Well, just prior to going down to Langley Field I was a research associate at Brown University on the unclassified war program they had there to develop mathematical and theoretical mechanics by the Government. The program was partly sponsored by the Government, and partly by private foundations. During my several months of work there I developed a theory which seemed to find an immediate application in aerodynamics. I believe it received a certain amount of publicity at the time. It was just about the time that I received a communication from the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, suggesting that I come down there and work in closer contact with some of the people who were doing theoretical high-speed motion work. The theory I developed at Brown seemed to be a partial solution to the theoretical problem on high-speed laws, and I believe that was the reason why the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics got in touch with me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever, at any time, give any classified information to any unauthorized party?

Dr. GELBART. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever have access later on to this material at Syracuse University?

Dr. GELBART. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you explain that to the committee?

Dr. GELBART. The classified material was not very great, but I worked on contract after leaving the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics at Langley Field, with the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

When I left there, they suggested that I take a contract back with me to Syracuse and continue the work I had been doing there at Syracuse, because the nature of my work was such that it didn't find immediate and necessary needs. Since then it has been used by the theoretical division of airplane companies and branches of aeronautics, but my own work has long been of a basic theoretical nature.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then while you were at Syracuse, you were also being paid by the Federal Government?

Dr. GELBART. I believe that the mechanics of the thing was for the Government to contract Syracuse, and the Government to pay Syracuse University and Syracuse to pay me. So my checks were from Syracuse and from the Government.

Mr. KUNZIG. Over what period of time were you on this basis, where part of your salary came from the Government?

Dr. GELBART. I wish to correct that. It was always from Syracuse University.

Mr. KUNZIG. I understand, but I mean when Syracuse University was reimbursed by the Federal Government, and then paid you.

Dr. GELBART. Well, I still am, if you consider other branches of the Government, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, then on and off, until the present day.

Mr. CLARDY. You got more than one check? One from the university for your professional work and one from the Government?

Dr. GELBART. No, you see—

Mr. CLARDY. You made it sound that way.

Mr. KUNZIG. Part of your salary was for work done on this contract basis, and emanated through the university from the Government?

Dr. GELBART. May I speak for a moment? The way this is done, the Government contracts with the university for a piece of work to be done and specifies a certain individual and his assistants to do the work. What the university does when they make this contract is to ask the director (in this case I was always the director), to give up a part of his teaching load, so that he would have time to do this research, and the check he gets is the same as if he were teaching full time. There is no change in pay. He simply gets the same check. The difference is, he teaches part time, and does research part time.

Mr. CLARDY. A certain part of the pay is for teaching, and the other is for work on research?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. We have had it described a little differently by other witnesses.

Dr. GELBART. I believe the people in physical science work differently.

Mr. KUNZIG. It is correct, is it not, that Syracuse University receives in this type of arrangement, a certain amount of money from the Federal Government?

Dr. GELBART. Definitely, definitely.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have stated there was more than one group. Would you take them one by one, from the period of time you left

Langley Field, and tell which ones they were, and over what period of time?

Dr. GELBART. I cannot recall the dates because on and off, as I say, I have been working on these Government research projects. After 1945 or 1946 none of them were classified. They were what we call basic research and they were not classified, but the university had contracts, of which I was the director, with the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, with the Office of Naval Research, and other offices of scientific research. I believe some were with the Army Air Force.

Mr. KUNZIG. These were, on and off, during what period of time?

Dr. GELBART. From 1943 to 1944, I think, and then there was a lapse. I didn't begin on a National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics contract until 1944. I want to make it clear that while I was in Europe as a Fulbright, I was not under contract. In 1947 or 1948, I was a member of a group doing advanced study, and I was not under contract. That was in Princeton, N. J. In 1948 I was not under contract.

Mr. KUNZIG. During the other times, off and on, you were under contract?

Dr. GELBART. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Gelbart, were you ever a member of the Teacher's Union while in Boston?

Dr. GELBART. Never.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever a member of any Teacher's Union?

Dr. GELBART. Never.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever a member of the Young Communist League?

Dr. GELBART. I will decline to answer that, for the same reason given previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know a Norman Putter?

Dr. GELBART. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend a reception in May 1948 in his honor?

Dr. GELBART. I have no special recollection of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Under what circumstances did you know Norman Putter?

Dr. GELBART. Oh, I think I just met him socially.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you a close friend of Mr. Putter?

Dr. GELBART. I wouldn't say so.

Mr. KUNZIG. During what period of time have you known Norman Putter?

Dr. GELBART. I am not too clear on that, but I would say, on and off, from 1945 or 1946 on.

Mr. KUNZIG. In conclusion, Professor Gelbart, I want to ask you once again to search your mind carefully and clearly—did you attend meetings of the Communist Party cell or group at MIT, during the time you were at MIT from 1938 to 1940?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever, not confined to 1938 or 1940—did you ever at any time attend meetings of the Communist Party groups?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, do you have any questions for the witness?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. You have been asked, Professor Gelbart, whether you attended any of the meetings. I wonder if you have knowledge at the time you were at MIT of the existence of any Communist Party group at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you have any knowledge of the existence of a group called the Young Communist League while you were there?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have, or did you have at any time, any acquaintance who was (and we exclude those who have been named) a member of the Communist Party, or the Young Communist League while you were at MIT?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know any member of either the Communist Party or the Young Communist League, as of now?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Dr. GELBART. Would you state that question again? Do you mean who are members today, may I ask?

Mr. CLARDY. No, I meant to ask if you today know anyone—put it this way—do you know today anyone who has ever been a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League?

Dr. GELBART. I must decline to answer that for the reason given previously.

Mr. CLARDY. I will repeat the question that has been asked many times before, and suggest that you reconsider and answer. Have you ever at any time been a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. CLARDY. Go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter, or Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Doctor, did I understand you to say that the work you have been doing for the Government was classified?

Dr. GELBART. It was classified at the time I began doing it, but it was very quickly declassified after the war.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever receive any compensation or anything of value, directly or indirectly, from the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. Never, to my knowledge.

Mr. SCHERER. Why do you qualify it by saying "to your knowledge"?

Dr. GELBART. I just want to answer it that way.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever pass any classified information on to persons who were not authorized to receive same?

Dr. GELBART. May I say never, to my knowledge, or never?

Mr. SCHERER. What is your answer?

Dr. GELBART. Never, to my knowledge. Emphatically not.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever contribute any funds to the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. ANDREWS. May I ask what that question was again?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever contribute any funds to the Communist Party?

Mr. VELDE. You may confer with your witness, Mr. Counsel, if you desire.

(Mr. Andrews confers with the witness.)

Dr. GELBART. Never, to my knowledge.

Mr. SCHERER. I think I will stop there.

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I think I do. Doctor, from the testimony and public record—

Dr. GELBART. Excuse me. May I go back to the question again and answer that? Is it possible to go back?

Mr. VELDE. You can explain the answer again, if you care to.

Dr. GELBART. May I have the question again, please?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever contribute any funds to the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. May I decline to answer?

Mr. SCHERER. You may make that statement. We are not withdrawing from the record your previous statement, however.

Dr. GELBART. May I make the request to withdraw that answer, please?

Mr. VELDE. You may make the request to withdraw the answer, but the request will be denied—however, I might say that you are permitted to explain any answer you might have given to a previous question, if you desire to make some explanation for the purpose of the record.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show that present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, and that I have appointed a subcommittee of the full committee, consisting of the members present, for the purposes of this hearing.

Mr. CLARDY. May I further say, Mr. Chairman, that if he wants to say why he flatly denied it, he is perfectly free to say that?

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. I think I can observe from a knowledge of your public record as a distinguished educator, and from what you have said this morning, that you also have been engaged in the field of research, finding out facts in your professional area. Now you have contributed much to the field of education, and to progress in your field, because you have been diligent in your research. You have learned from other men what you felt you could learn.

In a very similar manner, this committee is assigned, by statutory law, to go into the field of research, and to determine the extent of the activities of any subversive people, or groups of people, in our country. This is not confined to subversive Communists, but to subversive Fascists, and to subversive anybody, who are determined to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

I know, therefore, that you know the value of research, its importance, and its necessity.

Dr. GELBART. Yes, sir.

MR. DOYLE. I made that statement because I feel, from listening to this hearing, that you are in an area of appreciation of the obligation this committee has, as a committee of Congress. It has a difficult but important task to perform in the field of research, as to subversive activities in this country.

I noticed particularly two answers of yours, and also the fact you were a Fulbright scholar. May I preface these two questions now by saying I would be surprised if a Fulbright scholar wasn't inquisitive. I would be surprised if a Fulbright scholar wasn't exceedingly inquisitive in any field in which he wished to inquire, even to the extent of joining the Young Communist League many years ago when it was active.

Possibly you were identified with the Young Communist League many years ago. Suppose you were? I am assuming you weren't subversive in your attitude, even if you were a member of that Young Communist League, or merely identified with it. That must have been prior to 1938 in history. You were a young man then.

You were asked by our distinguished counsel whether or not, during the period of 1938 or 1940 you were a member of a Communist cell at MIT. 1938 was many years ago. 1940 is many years ago, as history goes.

Again, I can understand how men really searching for the truth might be searching into areas 10 or 20 years ago that they wouldn't waste time on now, 15 years later. The reason I take your time, and the committee's time, to lay this premise, is just this: If you were identified with the Young Communist League, the Communist Party, or a Communist cell way back there—you have said you are not now a Communist—and I assume from your testimony, and by putting 2 and 2 together, that if you were a Communist, you haven't been for many years. In other words, your research may have led you into the movement temporarily, but you got out of it because your brain and research dictated to you there was nothing there for you.

Now, if that is the case, why can't you help a congressional committee to go into its field of research, with your assistance? Granting that it might be personally difficult for you to say you ever had been a member of the Communist Party or a Communist group, we can understand that. That doesn't, however, label you as subversive, in my judgment. I would say the same goes for the committee members present, for as I understand their attitude, we are a unit. Because a man has been a member of the Young Communist League, or a member of a Communist cell, that doesn't actually mean he was subversive. At least that is my position.

I don't assume, and don't think any committee member assumes, that because a man in 1938 was a member of a Communist cell at MIT, and then got out and stayed out, he was necessarily subversive at the time, or ever had been subversive. It should not be fatal to his reputation that temporarily he was in the field of research, philosophy, or otherwise.

I am taking this time because I feel some of these observations very definitely apply to you. I think you are one of the men in the field of education who could help this committee find out to what extent the Communist movement infiltrated into the field of education at MIT, or anywhere else. That is our job of research. Why can't you join us in it?

I am giving you that thought very vigorously, Doctor. Whether you do it today or tomorrow, I am anticipating you are going to see it is your privilege or duty. I ask that you help us, instead of making it more difficult for us to complete our job.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have 1 or 2 more questions, if I may.

Mr. VELDE. I would first like to add a little statement to what Mr. Doyle has said here. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a legislative committee, as you realize, and it is not a court of law. There has never been a witness who has come before this committee, and who gave answers to questions truthfully, who have ever been prosecuted.

The committee, of course, cannot prosecute, as I am sure you have been advised by your able counsel. With that fact in mind, would you now tell us whether you were ever a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I would like to decline to answer that for reasons previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever issued a membership card by the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I would like to decline to answer that for the reason previously given.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you connected, while you were at MIT, with the American Association for Scientific Workers?

Dr. GELBART. I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain to the committee just what your connection was with that group?

Dr. GELBART. I think I was a student member of the group and attended meetings. I know I was a student member.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a very active member?

Dr. GELBART. I think I was for a little while.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KUNZIG. What sort of activity resulted from your connection with the group?

Dr. GELBART. I think my job was mostly to put up posters about meetings, mailing out material, and licking stamps. I was asked to do other work in that connection, and for a short period of time I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. I wonder if you would answer this question?

Do you feel today that a present member of the Communist Party should be allowed to teach in the schools of America?

Dr. GELBART. I sincerely say that I don't know the facts too well, but I presume from what I understand of it that one should not teach in the schools today.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you mean that you don't know the facts of communism and what it stands for today very well?

Dr. GELBART. Yes. Certainly from all I read in the newspapers and from all I understand, I believe it would be wrong for a person such as that to teach in the schools today.

Mr. VELDE. Are there any other questions?

Mr. SCHERER. You said that you were not a member of the Communist Party today. I want to ask you if you were a member in 1950?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. In 1948 were you a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the same reason previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you in 1949 a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. A while ago you stated you had not contributed funds to the Communist Party. Now, I would like to ask you this question. Have you ever paid Communist Party dues to any cell of the Communist Party?

Dr. GELBART. I decline to answer for the reason previously given.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be required to remain any longer?

Mr. KUNZIG. No. I would like the record to show that witness was originally represented by William D. Johnson, who asked for one continuance, which was granted. Mr. Johnson, who represents Syracuse University, could not represent both parties, and when new counsel, Dean Paul S. Andrews came into the case, he requested a further continuance. So there have been two continuances for this witness, at the request of counsels. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is dismissed.

(Counsel for the witness, Mr. Paul S. Andrews, asked permission of the chairman to make a statement for the record. Upon being given this permission, he made a statement, as follows:)

Mr. ANDREWS. I have been deeply impressed with the fairness shown by this committee in its entire action here; and my client has repeatedly stated to me, in private conference, that he, too, was deeply impressed by the same thing, and that he felt the committee had been utterly fair and considerate. This committee has given my client opportunity to confer with me, and to confer with members of the committee. I was impressed also yesterday, if I may say so, with the attitude of the committee toward another witness. I was present in the hearing room when another witness was being interrogated. I have heard reports that this particular committee has been fair, but the extent to which they are fair, decent, and considerate, I had not hitherto appreciated. I am very grateful to have the privilege of putting this statement on the record.

Mr. VELDE. The committee certainly thanks you. Especially so, in view of some of the smear tactics used throughout the country, it has been refreshing.

Mr. ANDREWS. My actual knowledge, of course, has been confined to the hearing today, and that of yesterday.

Mr. CLARDY. These hearings, I can tell you, are typical of the hearings we have been holding. There is one thing which distresses me. I am somewhat distressed by the witness, as it also appears was Mr. Doyle, to find a man, who in my mind can be helpful to our committee, doing himself an injustice by the way he has conducted himself during this hearing. As the chairman has said, no one has yet had any sanction visited on him at any time when he has fully and completely answered the questions. It is pretty hard to guess in advance what the reaction will be when the witness does not do that. We have bent over backward to try to persuade the witness, and Mr. Doyle has today bared his soul, so to speak.

Mr. KUNZIG. We know. It distresses me also when they will not answer fully.

Mr. ANDREWS. It distresses me, too. May I say, however, that as far as I know from my conversations with my client, he has no information which would be helpful to the committee.

Mr. VELDE. If we are going to get into arguments over the testimony, we will have to have the same rule as before.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I should like, if I may, to ask the privilege for Dr. Gelbart to make a statement here which explains his attitude toward the fifth amendment. I think it would be fair of the committee to put that into the record.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will accept the statement which had been prepared and considered for that purpose.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you very much, sir.

Dr. GELBART. May I have the privilege of making a very short explanatory statement?

I am informed that historically the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was conceived and intended as a protection to innocent persons, and that invoking it is neither legally, nor in fact, equivalent to an admission of wrongdoing.

I am well known to be, and for some years past to have been, utterly opposed to communism. But to prove that 10 and 13 years ago I was equally opposed would be difficult. Proving after so long a time that one did not have certain beliefs is a most difficult thing to do.

I am aware that if I could truthfully swear that I was once a Communist or Communist sympathizer and had since changed to the anti-Communist views, which in fact I hold, I might hope to be much better off, and might hope for the same favorable treatment from the committee, and from my university, as was accorded Professors Martin, Levinson, and Amdur.

However, I am also informed that if I should make statements contrary to the testimony of these three professors, who believed I had once been a Communist, it might make trouble for them; and in addition, that my own case might be turned over to the Department of Justice, with a view to prosecution.

I cannot face this prospect. This is not a plea for sympathy, but simply the fact that after a month of anguish, strain, and sleeplessness at being accused as a former Communist, and by implication as having been disloyal to my beloved country for which at all times I would have laid down my life, I cannot endure such a prospect of continued strain and humiliation.

Therefore, I have regretfully decided that I must invoke the fifth amendment, instead of fighting these accusations, and decline to answer any questions in any form which directly or by implication, ask me to make statements contrary to the testimony of Martin, Levinson, and Amdur; or any questions as to whether in the past I was a Communist member or sympathizer, on the ground that my answer would expose me to the probability of being prosecuted under the criminal statutes.

Mr. VELDE. The hearing is adjourned, until further call of the Chair.

(Whereupon at 1:20 p. m., the hearing was adjourned, until further call of the Chair.)

## APPENDIX

---

(NOTE.—In a preliminary discussion between the witness and members of the committee, Professor Gelbart indicated that there might be some question regarding the identification made of him as a member of the Communist Party by Profs. Isadore Amdur, Norman Levinson, and William Ted Martin. In order to resolve the question as to the accuracy of the identification of Professor Gelbart as a member of the Communist Party by the three persons mentioned herein, the following letters are included in the record of these hearings. These letters were obtained subsequent to the appearance of Professor Gelbart before the committee.)

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART,  
Boston 9, Mass., June 3, 1953.

MR. LOUIS RUSSELL,  
*House Committee on Un-American Activities,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: At the request of Mr. George E. Cooper of your staff, I am enclosing a copy of a letter that Prof. Norman Levinson wrote under date of May 25, 1953, to Dr. Finla G. Crawford, vice chancellor of Syracuse University.

Yesterday morning Professors Martin, Amdur, and Levinson and I talked at some length with Mr. Cooper, and I am writing this letter to you at his suggestion.

We understand from Mr. Cooper that the committee is concerned as to whether or not my three clients have in subsequent statements departed materially from that testimony which they gave the committee with particular reference to D. A. M. Gelbart, now at Syracuse University.

I am glad of an opportunity to put in writing to you in their behalf the substance of what we told Mr. Cooper at our conference. All three men testified honestly and sincerely before the committee, and they stand by their testimony. They have no intention of departing from it. Professor Levinson's position is accurately set forth in his letter to Dr. Crawford. I believe he has a less specific recollection of Gelbart's actual attendance at meetings than Professors Amdur and Martin. As far as those two are concerned, they do recall attendance by Dr. Gelbart at meetings which they regarded and considered as meetings of Communist Party members. They cannot say specifically at just what meetings or how many Gelbart was present. They have no recollection or knowledge of his having paid dues or signing or carrying a Communist Party card. Because of his attendance at these meetings, they assumed him to be a party member and so considered him. They have not made statements to the contrary.

I sincerely trust that this letter will be sufficient to close the matter as far as my three clients are concerned. They were all three extremely reluctant to give the names of others who had participated in meetings which they had attended. After careful and conscientious thought, they came to the conclusion that it was their duty to do so. It would be extremely embarrassing and I believe harmful to them in their relations with their professional colleagues and students to have to go over the matter again, and I trust that the committee will not feel it necessary to do so.

Sincerely,

STUART C. RAND,

MAY 25, 1953.

DR. FINLA G. CRAWFORD,

*Vice Chancellor, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.*

DEAR DR. CRAWFORD: In my testimony before the House Un-American Committee on April 23, 1953, I stated that I remembered Abe Gelbart, of your faculty, as a member of a group of Communists at MIT.

I would like to amplify what it is that I remember after the lapse of some 13 years. I do not recall any of the meetings of that Communist group nor any specifically Communist activity of the group. What is the case is that cataloged in my mind are a number of people labeled as Communists. Among them is Gelbart. Exactly why he is labeled as a Communist in my memory, rather than a leftist or a fellow traveler, I do not know.

In my testimony I also state that in 1946 or 1947 Gelbart told me he had left the Communist Party. After considerable thought about what it was that Gelbart told me, I believe that my statement is more of an interpretation on my part of our conversation than a quotation. In fact as I reconstruct the conversation, Gelbart began by asking me if I were still a Communist. (My politics had been common knowledge among mathematicians.) I replied in the negative and made some strongly disapproving remarks about the Communist Party. Gelbart made a reply of strong concurrence with these views and expressed disgust with Communist policies. Since I had regarded him in my own mind as a Communist, I interpreted his statement to have the same significance as my own, namely, an expression of withdrawal from the Communist Party.

Yours truly,

NORMAN LEVINSON.

# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

Page

|                         |                                                                 |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Amdur, Isadore          | 1523, 1525, 1538, 1549, 1551, 1567-1569, 1572, 1573, 1582, 1583 |
| Andrews, Paul Shipman   | 1565-1582                                                       |
| Arguimbau, Lawrence     | 1550, 1551, 1567, 1569                                          |
| Blaisdell, Ballis Edwin | 1549, 1567                                                      |
| Browder, Earl           | 1543, 1568                                                      |
| Brown, Jerry            | 1506                                                            |
| Cooper, George          | 1522, 1523, 1525, 1527, 1583                                    |
| Cort, Joe               | 1506                                                            |
| Crawford, Finla G       | 1583, 1584                                                      |
| Davis, Robert Gorham    | 1516, 1517, 1519, 1523, 1525, 1532, 1548, 1551, 1567            |
| Dontzin, Ben            | 1506                                                            |
| Duclos, Jacques         | 1542                                                            |
| Ford, Charles B         | 1511-1535                                                       |
| Furry, Wendell H        | 1549, 1551, 1562, 1567-1569                                     |
| Gelbart, Abe            | 1565-1582 (testimony)                                           |
| Goldschmidt, Mr         | 1571                                                            |
| Halperin, Israel        | 1550, 1567, 1569, 1570                                          |
| Johnson, William D      | 1581                                                            |
| Levinson, Norman        | 1523, 1525, 1549, 1551, 1567, 1569, 1572, 1573, 1582-1584       |
| Levy, Arthur            | 1505                                                            |
| Loewner, Charles        | 1571                                                            |
| Markham, Helen Deane    | 1550-1552, 1570                                                 |
| Marks, Harry            | 1521, 1522                                                      |
| Martin, William Ted     | 1538, 1550, 1551, 1566-1569, 1572, 1573, 1582, 1583             |
| Morrison, Philip        | 1551                                                            |
| Parry, William T        | 1511-1535 (testimony), 1550, 1567                               |
| Pollitt, Daniel H       | 1557-1564                                                       |
| Polumbaum, Theodore     | 1505                                                            |
| Putter, Norman          | 1576                                                            |
| Rand, Stuart C          | 1583                                                            |
| Rein, David             | 1503-1510                                                       |
| Reynolds, John H        | 1549, 1551, 1567                                                |
| Robbins, Herbert Ellis  | 1522                                                            |
| Russell, Louis          | 1583                                                            |
| Russo, Mike             | 1506                                                            |
| Singer, Marcus          | 1537-1564 (testimony)                                           |
| Struik, Dirk J          | 1523, 1525, 1550, 1551, 1567, 1569                              |
| Woerner, Harold T       | 1503-1510 (testimony)                                           |
| Zilsel, Paul            | 1506                                                            |

## ORGANIZATIONS

|                                             |                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| American Association for Scientific Workers | 1580                                                                 |
| American Federation of Teachers             | 1527                                                                 |
| Brown University                            | 1566, 1574                                                           |
| Columbia University                         | 1512                                                                 |
| Cornell University                          | 1538, 1551                                                           |
| Dartmouth College                           | 1504                                                                 |
| Harvard Medical School                      | 1556                                                                 |
| Harvard University                          | 1512, 1513, 1516-1521, 1523, 1527, 1533-1535, 1538, 1544, 1545, 1556 |
| Hunter College                              | 1515, 1516                                                           |
| Long Island College of Medicine             | 1538                                                                 |

|                                                                       |                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Massachusetts Institute of Technology-----                            | 1516.                        |
| 1549, 1556, 1566-1568, 1570, 1572, 1573, 1576, 1577, 1579, 1580, 1584 |                              |
| North Carolina State School of Engineering-----                       | 1566                         |
| Stanford University-----                                              | 1571                         |
| Syracuse College of Law-----                                          | 1565                         |
| Syracuse University-----                                              | 1566, 1572, 1575, 1581, 1583 |
| University of Buffalo-----                                            | 1512, 1516, 1533-1535        |
| University of Pittsburgh-----                                         | 1538                         |
| Yale University-----                                                  | 1504, 1505                   |

## PUBLICATIONS

|                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| The Communist----- | 1542       |
| Daily Worker-----  | 1559, 1560 |
| New Masses-----    | 1543       |





